

RESPONDING TO UNHEALTHY PROPERTIES: DEVELOPING A CENTRALIZED, CONSISTENT PROCESS FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY

A discussion paper for the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board

Prepared by:

Len Garis

Fire Chief, City of Surrey Fire Services and Adjunct Professor, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice,
University of the Fraser Valley

and

Dr. Joseph Clare

Strategic Planning Analyst, City of Surrey Fire Services

April, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Problem Statement.....	3
3	The Sources of Risk Posed by Inappropriate Use of Properties	4
3.1	<i>Damage to Properties.....</i>	4
3.2	<i>Environmental and Public Health Concerns.....</i>	4
3.3	<i>Insurability.....</i>	5
3.4	<i>These Concerns are Not Specific to Illegal Inappropriate Use</i>	5
4	Disclosure	6
4.1	<i>Caution with Disclosure: The Freedom of Information and Privacy Act.....</i>	6
4.2	<i>Inconsistencies with Respect to Disclosure</i>	8
4.3	<i>Potential Novel Approach to Addressing the Disclosure Issue</i>	8
5	Remediation	10
5.1	<i>The General Prototype Approach to Remediation in BC</i>	10
5.2	<i>Issues with the Various Existing Approaches to Remediation</i>	10
5.3	<i>Addressing these Limitations by Standardizing the Process</i>	12
6	A Top-Down, Centralized Process for Disclosure and Remediation	12
7	Recommendations	13
8	References.....	14

1 Executive Summary

- Currently in BC, it is not possible for any prospective property purchaser or tenant to be certain if a building they are interested in has: (a) been identified as having been used in an inappropriate, potentially unhealthy/unsafe manner, or (b) been remediated through a process that would ensure health and safety risks have been eradicated.
- This term, “inappropriate use”, incorporates a range of activities, including, but not restricted to, agricultural activity (e.g., grow-ops) and the production of synthetic drugs, which can result in significant damage to the properties. If inadequately remediated, this type of damage can have serious health and safety implications for occupants.
- As such, it is not possible to make an informed decision about the potential risk posed by any property of interest as a result of previous inappropriate, damaging use of the structure. Two major factors prevent members of the public from being able to make these informed decisions:
 - Inconsistent, incomplete disclosure of information about property history; and
 - Inconsistent processes for remediation of buildings found to have been used inappropriately.
- To alleviate these concerns, this paper makes three recommendations:
 - Develop a centralised, consistent process for disclosure of property history information.
 - Develop a centralised, consistent process for remediation of inappropriately used buildings.
 - Implement these disclosure and remediation processes in a top-down manner, with the BC provincial government playing the controlling role, and using existing BC provincial legislation as the foundation for this approach.
- Implementation of these recommendations would simultaneously reduce health and safety risks to building occupants and increase the ability of property purchasers/lessees/tenants to make informed decisions.

2 Problem Statement

As the situation currently stands in BC, potential property purchasers, lessees, and renters are unable to make informed decisions about the likelihood that prospective properties pose health and safety risks as a result of previous inappropriate use of the structure. There are two causal, related factors that have produced this concern. On the one hand, the current process for disclosure of information about properties that have been identified as having been used inappropriately is flawed. There is no centralised, consistent process in place to ensure this information is recorded and disseminated in a standardised, timely, meaningful manner. This first issue is exacerbated by the unreliable, inconsistent processes for remediating buildings that have been identified as having been used inappropriately. As a consequence of these two issues, it is not possible to know unequivocally whether: (a) a building in BC has been identified as having previously been used for inappropriate, potentially unhealthy/unsafe purposes, or (b) how the remediation process was executed (if at all) when the building was identified as having experienced inappropriate use.

3 The Sources of Risk Posed by Inappropriate Use of Properties

3.1 Damage to Properties

There is a range of ways in which inappropriate use of a building can result in significant physical damage. The most obvious of these involves unauthorised alteration to the building's support structures; for example, cutting into foundations for ventilation and power access. These renovations can extend as far as manipulating chimneys and roofs. The combined effect of these alterations is to severely degrade the structural integrity of the building. Following from this, wiring defects are another issue that frequently require remediation. These alterations are often completed to a poor quality standard by unqualified individuals who are aiming to achieve one or more of the following: (a) illegally bypass electrical metres with a view to stealing power, (b) enable power to be provided to the structure by additional means, such as generators, and (c) internal rewiring to support a large number of industrial strength grow-lamps. The substandard workmanship and the absence of standardised safety processes mean that these properties pose a highly elevated risk for electrocution and fire after these electrical renovations. When buildings are used for these inappropriate purposes, there can also be a large amount of moisture damage that can significantly deteriorate the building's structural materials. Finally, there is the potential that inappropriate disposal of dangerous goods through the drainage system can degrade the plumbing infrastructure to the extent that it may need to be replaced. This process can also result in toxic contamination of the surrounding ground water supplies to the extent that the content of these areas would need to be reclaimed.

3.2 Environmental and Public Health Concerns

In contrast to these overt signs of physical damage, the environmental and public health concerns that emerge from inappropriate use of properties can also produce an alternative class of hazards, typically more difficult to detect and harder to address (as discussed by Lee & Rollins, 2009). The first of these, mould and fungi, typically grow in conditions of high humidity, poor ventilation, and heat. These do not always grow in obvious places (e.g., they can prosper inside wall cavities) and are highly resilient, so without proper remediation they are very likely to return. Given that mould has the potential to be allergenic, pathogenic, or toxigenic, its presence within commercial or residential buildings creates a significant health concern for future building occupants (Lee & Rollins, 2009). In combination with chemicals such as pesticides and fertilizers, these microscopic organic particles can linger for lengthy periods of time after the source of the contaminant has been removed, significantly impacting on the safety and quality of the air inside the property. Inappropriate use of commercial or residential buildings for agricultural purposes can also result in toxic residue contaminating the building materials and the soil in the building's surrounds. This issue can persist even after the source of the contaminants has been removed, as a result of spills, over-spraying, and the absorbent properties of building materials (Lee & Rollins, 2009). Finally, following from the potential damage to the plumbing infrastructure of these buildings discussed previously, inappropriately disposing of chemicals through the drains or onto the ground can also cause contamination to the local ground water.

3.3 Insurability

Section 11, *Permitted Exclusions - Defects* (1) and (2) of the *Home Warranty Insurance and Statutory Protection* clause of the *Homeowner Protection Act* permits warranty providers to exclude a range of items from home warranty insurance, including:

“(c) any loss or damage which arises while a new home is being used primarily or substantially for non-residential purposes;

(e) any damage to the extent that it is caused or made worse by an owner or third party, including:

(i) negligent or improper maintenance or improper operation by anyone other than the residential builder or its employees, agents or subcontractors [which includes bodily injury, or damage to personal property, caused by mould],

(ii) failure of anyone, other than the residential builder or its employees, agents or subcontractors, to comply with the warranty requirements of the manufacturers of appliances, equipment or fixtures,

(iii) alterations to the new home, including the conversion of non-living space into living space or the conversion of a dwelling unit into 2 or more units, by anyone other than the residential builder or its employees, agents or subcontractors while undertaking their obligations under the sales contract, and

(k) changes, alterations or additions made to a new home by anyone after initial occupancy, except those performed by the residential builder or its employees, agents or subcontractors as required by the home warranty insurance or under the construction contract or sales agreement;

(l) contaminated soil;

(n) diminution in the value of the new home.”

The implication of this legislation for prospective home purchasers is that, in addition to the health and safety issues that arise from the inappropriate use of dwellings, unknowingly purchasing properties that are potentially uninsurable (under the *Homeowner Protection Act*) also poses serious financial risks.

3.4 These Concerns are Not Specific to Illegal Inappropriate Use

Although these health and safety concerns do encompass the issues associated with using dwellings for the production of marijuana and methamphetamine, the problem is not illegal activity in the building, per se. Instead, it is the potential of injury/disease for interested buyers if they purchase properties that are unsafe/unhealthy without being able to make an informed decision about the risk. This risk is paralleled by prospective tenants when making a choice about potential rental properties. Legality of activity aside, therefore, the issue is the health and safety issues associated with improper use of buildings. Taking the case of indoor marijuana grow operations, for example, regardless as to whether the business owner has been granted a licence to produce (under the medicinal marijuana protocols), if the building is not zoned or constructed to be used for agricultural purposes, safety inspections have not been passed, and agricultural grade fertilizers/pesticides have been used, then the health and safety issues that result are equivalent to an illegal indoor marijuana grow operation. By extension, even if information is made available about the relevant history of a property, if there is an inconsistent, unreliable remediation process, then being informed a property has been remediated does not provide the necessary basis for an informed decision.

4 Disclosure

Across the Fraser Valley region¹, despite the implementation of a range of municipality-specific *Controlled Substance Property Bylaws*, there is a clear lack of desire to record any permanent information identifying properties as having been used inappropriately.² The one exception to this approach is the City of Surrey, which requires the owners of formerly remediated properties in perpetuity to provide written notification to any future occupants advising them that the building was formerly identified as needing rehabilitation and that the requirements of this rehabilitation process were met. Furthermore, a notice is included on the City of Surrey property tax certificate advising that the property is/was subject to a bylaw infraction (with the number of the bylaw cited).

In contrast, the City of Abbotsford ensures that all references to inappropriate use are removed from the property land title when the structure is deemed to have been successfully remediated. However, the records relating to the inappropriate use of the property are kept by the city for seven years, in accordance with the city's record management system. This means that some documents associated with inappropriate use of buildings in Abbotsford can be accessed via a Freedom of Information request. In addition to this, the city also keeps searchable binders at their front counter which contain dates when notices were filed and removed.

These approaches both contrast the positions currently adopted by the City and the Township of Langley, neither of which rely on their own employees to make judgements about the success of remediation and the corresponding inhabitation of the property. This simultaneously reduces each municipality's liability in any post-rehabilitation health and safety complications, and also means that neither municipality possess complete information about the outcome of any rehabilitation process. Once again, no permanent record is made to the property title or tax certificate in either Langley municipality that would indicate a remediation process had taken place.

4.1 Caution with Disclosure: The *Freedom of Information and Privacy Act*

As it stands, the default strategy from institutions in possession of this information about known history of improper use of buildings is non-disclosure. The end result is that it is not currently possible to say definitively whether any given property in BC is currently or was previously used inappropriately. There are at least two reasons for this. First is the inconsistent sharing of information between agencies (e.g., police, bylaw inspectors, and others). Second is the lack of a centralized, searchable record of identified and/or remediated unhealthy dwellings. The major impediment to this information flow seems to be public officials' interpretation and understanding of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* RSBC 1996 (*FIPPA*). Given the penalties for non-compliance with the *FIPPA* include fines of up to \$25,000 for a service provider and up to \$500,000 for a corporation, non-disclosure has been

¹ For the purposes of this paper, "Fraser Valley" refers to the communities of Abbotsford, Mission, Langley City and Township, Surrey, White Rock and Delta – the communities in which members of the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board live and work.

² These issues are discussed fully within a White Paper Discussion entitled, "Standards of Reporting and Remediation: The Impact of Illegal Drug Operations on Housing", prepared for the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board in September 2008. Copies of this paper can be accessed by contacting the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board at mls@fvreb.bc.ca.

adopted as the default stance by the majority of municipalities in BC with a view to limiting their liability exposure. The source of complication posed by *FIPPA* with respect to prospective buyers determining the safety of a potential purchase emerges as a consequence of the following steps:

1. *FIPPA* makes public bodies more accountable to the public and to protect personal privacy;
2. *FIPPA* gives the public the right of access to records with specified limitations (*accountability*);
3. One specified limitation to *FIPPA* is the disclosure of personal information (defined as “information about an identifiable individual”) by public bodies (*privacy*);
4. Information about any known history of improper use of a property is of immediate importance to potential buyers/lessees/tenants;
5. Information about any known history of improper use of a property has been determined by public officials to be personal information (with one concern to do with record linkage that potentially could result in the disclosure of personal information that causes harm to individuals);
6. Information about any known history of improper use of a property is not being disclosed, with *FIPPA* cited as the reason: privacy trumps accountability.

The reoccurring message here is that, for the most part, these municipalities are concerned about record keeping and disseminating information in cases where they have acted on evidence that buildings have been used inappropriately. The default strategy is to ensure that these records are non-permanent (when they are retained at all) and that they are not maintained in an easy-to-search format (such as a database). This protects the governments in these areas from being able to disseminate information that could later be perceived to have contravened *FIPPA*. However, it has not been determined by the Courts whether such disclosure actually does constitute a breach of this *Act*.

In the absence of a definitive Court ruling with respect to the legality of disclosing this type of information, an alternative, valuable perspective on this issue has been provided by the former BC Information and Privacy Commissioner, David Loukidelis, in a letter to Fire Chief Garis, City of Surrey Fire Services (November 22, 2007). It must be noted that Loukidelis’ perspective was qualified by stating that, “Because of my role investigating and enforcing privacy issues under the [*FIPPA*], I cannot give a formal much less binding opinion on any specific issue.” This caveat noted, however, Loukidelis continued to explain:

“...it can be argued that information about the physical condition of a particular property, or about any building bylaw or other bylaw infractions, notices or actions respecting a piece of property is not personal information of anyone, including the registered owner. FIPPA offers protections for personal information, which it defines as ‘information about an identifiable individual’, while information of the kind just mentioned is information about a piece of real estate, not about an identifiable individual. Of course, personal information may be found in or associated with this type of information, so a local government would have to ensure that it discloses only information about building bylaw or other bylaw infractions, notices or actions respecting the property and not personal information of individuals.”

This perspective was supported by subsequent correspondence from the Executive Director of the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of BC to the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board (June 24,

2008), which indicated that, “[t]here is a positive duty in law to disclose information about a significant risk to someone’s health or safety.”

4.2 Inconsistencies with Respect to Disclosure

In addition to disregarding these opinions that disclosure of health and safety information about properties should be occurring, the current practices with respect to disclosure about inappropriate use of buildings are also arguably inconsistent, being treated differently from other property information that is recorded and disclosed. The first major example of this involves the release of excessively-high power consumption data from BC Hydro to local municipalities. This information is released under the *Safety Standards Amendment Act* and gives an indication of inappropriate use of residential dwellings, in a manner that is highly likely to result in a fire-related health and safety risk. As it stands, approximately twelve municipalities in BC regularly access this information without any legal backlash with respect to breaches of *FIPPA*.³ Given BC Hydro collects this information about consumption as a key aspect of their business, there are no municipal boundaries at play here. The dissemination of this information actually represents a current, working example of a centralised process where information about potential inappropriate use of dwellings is disclosed.

A second, similarly centralised process is demonstrated by the BC Provincial Contaminated Site Registry, which is a registry of (a) confirmed contaminated sites, (b) sites under investigation for contamination, and (c) formerly contaminated sites that have been remediated. A contaminated site in this context is defined as “an area of land in which the soil or underlying groundwater or sediment contains a hazardous waste or substance in an amount or concentration that exceeds provincial environmental quality standards,” resulting in a site being unsuitable for specific land, water, and sediment uses (BC Ministry of Environment, 2009). All information gathered since 1988 about contaminated sites is completely accessible to the public and site-specific information can be attained via an online search at www.bconline.gov.bc.ca.

On a municipal level, it is also routine procedure to record permanent information about other building-specific information, such as renovations, building permits, and structural damage. Although there is no centralised process capturing this information, it is possible to visit municipal offices and learn about these aspects of a building’s history. These amendments to the building records are not temporary, removed from the record following remediation, in the same way that some municipalities currently deal with information about inappropriate use of dwellings.

4.3 Potential Novel Approach to Addressing the Disclosure Issue

Despite these inconsistencies, and working within the current concerns about privacy and disclosure, some alternatives for achieving the necessary dissemination of information have been proposed. Given

³ This is not to say that this process has not been scrutinised with respect to *FIPPA*, and the status quo has emerged as the outcome of extensive lobbying of the provincial government that led to the introduction of *Bill 25* (the *Safety Standards Amendment Act*) in 2006. Subsequent to this, the legitimacy of this process has been tested in the BC Supreme Court (2008) and the BC Court of Appeal (2010). In both instances the rulings have been upheld. For a comprehensive summary of these cases see Garis, L., Plecas, D., Cohen, I. M., & McCormick, A. V. (2009). *Community Response to Marijuana Grow Operations: A Guide Towards Promising Practices*. Surrey BC: City of Surrey. http://www.surrey.ca/files/DCT - Community Response to MGOs_Guide_Sept_2009.pdf

the former Information and Privacy Commissioner's perspective on the non-personal nature of information about (a) the physical condition of a particular property, (b) any building bylaw or other bylaw infractions of a particular property, or (c) any notices or actions respecting a piece of property, the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board has proposed a protocol which would enable members of the public and real estate professionals representing them to access information necessary to make an informed decision about a property without contravening *FIPPA*. Potential wordings that have been trialed (Garis & Bond, 2010) include:

- According to City records, has the property ever been investigated for the cultivation of marijuana or as a clandestine drug lab?
- Was the property ever invoiced by the City on the basis that it had been used for cultivation of marijuana or as a clandestine drug lab enforced at this property?
- Was a City action taken as a result of findings in a residential building on the property?
- Was a City action taken as a result of findings in a non-residential outbuilding, barn, shed or other shelter situated away from the residence?
- Has the City's Controlled *Substance Property Bylaw* been enforced at this property?
- Have the requirements of the action been undertaken such that the requirements of the Bylaw or other City order been satisfied?
- If the answer to any of the above questions is "yes," and the potential purchaser/lessee/tenant of the property are still interested in the property, they may wish to ask, "What was the date of the occurrence?"

The assumption underlying the proposal of these questions is that they could be answered by officials with a yes/no response without contravening the scope of *FIPPA*. Garis and Bond (2010)⁴ then discuss that if this argument is incorrect, and that personal information was being disclosed when a property was listed for sale, this issue may be resolved by the property owner giving their consent to disclose, as explained by Loukidelis (November 22, 2007):

"Even if this argument were wrong, such that personal information were being disclosed, when a property is listed for sale, the seller could consent in writing at the time of listing to disclosure by the relevant local government of information about the condition of the property and whether it has been used for grow-ops or other illegal drug operations. This would avoid any issue under FIPPA altogether, since s.33.1(b) authorizes a local government to disclose personal information 'if the individual the information is about has identified the information and consented, in the prescribed manner, to its disclosure'."

In addition to this, Loukidelis (November 22, 2007) also outlined that the BC Real Estate Association property disclosure statement (Part 2, clause P) requires a yes/no response to the following: "Are you aware if the premises or property have been used as a marijuana grow operation or to manufacture illegal drugs?" Given that the answer to this question is a representation and warranty under any subsequent

⁴ The full paper is available at <http://www.surrey.ca/city-services/7388.aspx>

sale agreement, it is plausible that a failure to provide this information to a potential buyer would be good grounds for suspicion.⁵

5 Remediation

Moving on from the discussion of disclosure of information about improper use of dwellings, the next section of this report discusses the issues around the process for remediating unhealthy/unsafe buildings. In their discussion paper that focused on marijuana grow operations, Garis, Plecas, Cohen, and McCormick (2009) explain that it is essential that the damage done to properties that have been used inappropriately are completely remediated before they are reoccupied. The primary purpose for this remediation is to ensure these buildings do not become abandoned. This issue can be (and, in a range of BC municipalities, is being) addressed through the use of bylaws that place the remediation costs back onto the property owner. However the issue that remains is that the current process allows inconsistent, highly variable standards to influence the remediation of these structures.

5.1 The General Prototype Approach to Remediation in BC

As with the approaches to disclosure already discussed, across BC there is a wide range of approaches to remediation of properties that have been identified as having experienced inappropriate use. Grounded in municipal bylaws, the general approach to remediation that has been adopted contains some/all of the following components:

- A site visit is conducted by an inspection team under a locally developed *Controlled Substance Property Bylaw*;
- If inappropriate use is detected, further occupation is prohibited and a notice is served that commences the remediation process;
- Within a certain period of time the remediation requirements must be addressed;
- If these requirements are satisfactorily addressed, then the occupation prohibition is lifted.

This process occurs at the property owner's expense, and the final source of approval for the remediation process is a non-government, designated expert. In some cases the records of this process are kept in such a way that they can only be accessed by municipal staff and there is generally little to indicate in the permanent record that the property had been used in this inappropriate, potentially unhealthy/unsafe manner.

5.2 Issues with the Various Existing Approaches to Remediation

Although on first inspection these steps appear comprehensive and thorough, closer examination exposes a range of issues associated with these various approaches to remediation of inappropriately used buildings. To highlight this issue, Garis (2010) produced a summary paper entitled *Improving the Remediation Process for Marijuana Grow Operations* that succinctly summarises the outcomes of a

⁵ The BC Real Estate Association's property disclosure statement is not currently mandatory, and even if it were to become mandatory, this would not address the problems associated with property sales (a) conducted by real estate agents who do not belong to a real estate board/association, (b) conducted privately by property owners, and (c) for commercial properties. This would also not address issues arising for tenants and lessees as landlords are not required to complete this disclosure statement.

workshop involving remediation experts that focused on addressing concerns with the status quo. These issues are expanded in length within Garis's paper,⁶ but for the purposes of this paper they are summarized as follows:

- Due to a range of different qualifications that are available, different requirements for maintaining qualifications, rules about the number of qualified individuals required for a company to hold a licence, and necessary insurance standards, it is very difficult for laypeople to determine which service providers are appropriately qualified/certified to undertake remediation work.
- Uncertainty exists regarding the process and roles of environmental consultants and restoration companies in the remediation process.
- There are inconsistencies and inefficiencies in how these remediation processes are executed across municipalities, with no guarantee that remediation is being undertaken consistently and effectively to ensure that the work is completed correctly.
- The recommendations for the scope of remediation work required are often insufficient to complete the remediation task. This is often the consequence of the environmental consultants making recommendations following a superficial inspection, which tends to miss more covert damage (e.g., under carpets and within wall cavities). A detailed scope of work is essential to (a) ensure the property is completely and effectively remediated, and (b) enable the prospective buyers/lessees/tenants to know exactly what work was completed. In addition to the lack of clear scope of work for remediation, there are also additional logistical constraints with respect to the quantity of suitable remediation companies, hygienists, and Hazmat staff that are available to remediate inappropriately used dwellings (e.g., Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2007; Lee & Rollins, 2009).
- Inconsistencies are also an issue with respect to the quality of remediation work that is done. There is generally no obligation on the behalf of the property owner to procure the services of certified restoration companies. Consequently, property owners can cut corners to save money by doing remediation work themselves or hiring uncertified contractors. This generally has a detrimental impact on the quality of the workmanship, which directly impacts on the success of the remediation process and the subsequent amelioration of the health and safety risks created by the inappropriate use.
- Although remediation cannot generally be concluded without the authorisation of a certified industrial hygienist or registered occupational hygienist, it is rarely the case that these individuals are providing consistent project oversight for the duration of the remediation process. Furthermore, there are concerns about a lack of independence between the environmental consultants who originally scope the size of the damage, the cleaning companies responsible for the remediation, and the hygienists who sign-off on the process as being complete.
- Concerns about premature removal of the occupancy ban were also identified, stemming from the fact that the hygienist conducts their final site visit and inspection while the building's walls are still open for building/electrical inspection (and hence, not yet in a liveable state).

⁶ The full paper is available for download at <http://www.surrey.ca/city-services/7388.aspx>

5.3 Addressing these Limitations by Standardizing the Process

In order to address these issues, a coherent, clearly defined process needs to be developed and applied consistently. Following this, sufficient numbers of appropriately trained staff need to be deployed to ensure this remediation process is being adhered to. The fundamentally important issue here is that each instance of inappropriate use of a building needs to be assessed in its own rights, based on the context. This means that the process is the key and the issue as it stands is the inconsistency of the process. Garis's (2010) paper identified a set of detailed roles and recommendations that property owners, environmental consultants, restoration contractors, and governments must play in this process. Furthermore, Garis provided a concise process overview for remediation that included the following steps:

- Issuing and posting a "Do Not Occupy" order on the inappropriately used building;
- The government involved providing the property owner with the necessary information about the remediation process;
- The property owner hiring appropriate environmental consultants and restoration contractors;
- The environmental consultant investigating/assessing the site, preparing the scope of work for the restoration contractor, coordinating hiring registered professionals (as required), and monitoring remediation;
- The restoration contractor obtaining permits (by submission of documents prepared by registered professionals, as required), hiring trades, ensuring all work is completed and signing-off;
- The environmental consultant signing-off on the project and issuing a "Certificate of Entry";
- The property owner completing the finishing work on the property;
- The government involved receiving the final approvals from the environmental consultant of a successful final inspection, and subsequently removing the "Do Not Occupy" order; and
- Inclusion of a permanent record of remediation in the building records for the property.

6 A Top-Down, Centralized Process for Disclosure and Remediation

The question remains then as to what the best method is for achieving these revisions to the process for disclosure and remediation. In addressing these issues it is important to heed the position outlined in Loukidelis' (2006) report into local governments and the growth of surveillance, which discusses the scope for the provincial *Safety Standards Amendment Act, 2006* to be used to its full effect, rather than developing piecemeal municipal bylaws that attempt to combat criminal activity. Loukidelis (2006, p. 11) cautions against the development of municipal bylaws that would "compel businesses to collect, compile, or disclose customers' personal information" suggesting that:

"Such [bylaws] should only be adopted as a last resort. Other measures ought to be considered before a bylaw is entertained as a solution. A bylaw should be adopted only where conventional means for achieving the same law enforcement objectives are substantially less effective than the bylaw promises, on clear evidence, to be and the benefits of surveillance substantially outweigh any diminution of privacy inherent in the bylaw's operation."

The provincial *Safety Standards Amendment Act, 2006*, is the legislation that has enabled BC Hydro to provide power consumption information to municipal governments under the grounds of potentially

elevated health and safety risks. This has been achieved without contravening *FIPPA*. Consequently, the authors feel it is worth exploring other existing provincial legislation, such as the *BC Building Code*, the *BC Residential Tenancy Act*, and the *BC Homeowner Protection Act*, which all also dictate aspects of safety that apply across the province.

This move towards lobbying for taking provincial responsibility for these issues has already begun in other areas within Canada. In 2007 there were discussions in Toronto regarding the development of a provincial, centralized registry of indoor marijuana grow operations to help inform and protect consumers in the same sense as information regarding other hazards (e.g., flooding risks, and Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation). Indeed, it would make sense for such a registry, motivated by maximising public safety, to incorporate information about factors such as vermiculite, which are neither banned substances nor latent defects, but do pose potential liability risks at a later date if not disclosed when selling a property (as discussed by The Canadian Real Estate Association, 2005). Furthermore, Garis (2010, p. 3) discusses how “The Alberta Real Estate Association (AREA) is actively lobbying the provincial government for consistent standards for assessing and remediating drug houses to protect future property owners from structural and health problems.” As Lee and Rollins (2009, p. 2) explain:

Inconsistent interpretation of remediation procedures and techniques can lead to inadequate remediation resulting in a continued health and safety risk for occupants, or a costly and unnecessary sterilisation of a property. Recommendations adopted by the Province would remove inconsistencies and facilitate a more cohesive remediation process. They would also assure prospective property buyers in Alberta that all properties identified as illegal drug operations have been restored to a provincial standard (Lee & Rollins, 2009, p. 2)

7 Recommendations

In conclusion, and with a view to lobbying for administrative change, there are three recommendations from this report. In combination, these amendments to current processes would better enable BC residents to make informed decisions about the potential health and safety risks posed by residential buildings they are looking to purchase, lease or rent. As suggested from the outset, these recommendations make no comment about the legality of inappropriate activity in properties. The three recommendations are as follows:

1. Develop a centralised, consistent process for disclosure of property history information

A consistent process needs to be developed, which does not breach *FIPPA*, for ensuring that information about inappropriate use and remediation is available in a timely, straightforward manner. This process would need to enable prospective property purchasers/lessees/tenants to learn about the relevant history of the property to ensure they could make an informed decision about the potential health and safety risks.

2. Develop a centralised, consistent process for remediation of inappropriately used buildings

As the situation currently stands in BC, even if potential purchasers/tenants are able to learn about the history of inappropriate use and/or remediation at a specific property, they are unable to be certain

that the property has been safely and completely remediated. In order to address this issue, it is recommended that a consistent process for remediation is developed that enables each remediation situation to be addressed in its own right, whilst providing a framework for determining:

- What is required to be tested and remediated?
- Who is responsible for completing the remediation process?
- What is the time frame within which remediation must take place?
- Who is responsible for assessing the completeness of the remediation process and guaranteeing it has been undertaken?
- Who is responsible for determining when buildings are safe to be occupied following remediation?
- What are the impacts, if any, for the insurability of the building?
- How and where is this documented?

3. Implement these disclosure and remediation processes in a top-down manner, founded in existing BC provincial legislation

To address municipal boundary issues about information sharing and to avoid unnecessary legislation being developed, it is recommended that the disclosure process and remediation process both be implemented in a top-down manner, directed by the BC provincial government, and founded on the existing legislative framework provided by Acts such as the *Safety Standards Amendment Act, 2006*, the *BC Building Code*, the *BC Residential Tenancy Act*, and the *BC Homeowner Protection Act*.

8 References

- BC Ministry of Environment. (2009). An introduction to contaminated sites in British Columbia. from http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/epd/remediation/fact_sheets/pdf/fs01.pdf
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (2007). *A discussion paper on indoor air quality investigations of houses used for marijuana grow operations*. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Email from the Executive Director of the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of BC. (June 24, 2008). Sent to the Fraser Valley Real Estate Board Communications Department (Ed.).
- Garis, L. (2010). *Improving the remediation process for marijuana grow operations: a discussion paper*: University of the Fraser Valley, School of Criminology.
- Garis, L., & Bond, J. (2010). *Disclosure of controlled substance properties and the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. City of Surrey: Surrey Fire Services.
- Garis, L., Plecas, D., Cohen, I. M., & McCormick, A. V. (2009). *Community Response to Marijuana Grow Operations: A Guide Towards Promising Practices*. Surrey BC: City of Surrey.
- Lee, T. G., & Rollins, K. (2009). *Recommendations for the assessment and remediation of properties used as illegal drug operations*. Calgary: Report prepared by Lee and de Ridder Architects and Indoor Air Quality Management for Alberta Real Estate Association (AREA).
- Letter from the Information and Privacy Commissioner of BC. (November 22, 2007). Sent to the Fire Chief Len Garis Surrey Fire Services (Ed.).

Loukidelis, D. (2006). *Local Governments and the Growth of Surveillance*. Victoria: Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of British Columbia.

The Canadian Real Estate Association. (2005). *Vermiculite insulation and asbestos: information for REALTORS*. Ottawa, Ontario: The Canadian Real Estate Association.

Author Biographical Information

- Len Garis is the Fire Chief for the City of Surrey, BC and is an Adjunct Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of the Fraser Valley and a member of the Institute of Canadian Urban Research Studies, Simon Fraser University. Contact him at LWGaris@surrey.ca.
- Dr. Joseph Clare, strategic planning analyst for the Surrey Fire Service, is an Associate Professor in the Crime Research Centre, University of Western Australia, and a member of the Institute of Canadian Urban Research Studies, Simon Fraser University. Contact him at jclare@surrey.ca.