Regional District of Central Kootenay
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
Open Meeting Agenda

Date: Thursday, January 16, 2020
Time: 9:00 am
Location: RDCK Board Room, 202 Lakeside Dr., Nelson, BC

Directors will have the opportunity to participate in the meeting electronically. Proceedings are open to the public.

1. CALL TO ORDER & WELCOME

1.1 TRADITIONAL LANDS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT
We acknowledge and respect the indigenous peoples within whose traditional lands we are meeting today.

1.2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

The agenda for the January 16, 2020 Regular Open Board meeting be adopted as circulated with the addition of the addendum.

1.3 ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

The minutes from the December 12, 2019 Regular Open Board meeting be adopted as circulated.

1.4 INTRODUCTIONS
John Southam will introduce Donna Carmichael, Building Administrative Assistant.

Heather Smith will introduce Brook Atkins, Payroll Lead.
1.5 DELEGATION(S)

1.5.1 Nelson’s Cannabis Lets Get it Right Forum

Brenton Raby & Sabin O Donohue

2. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

2.1 Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalition: Resolution 844/19

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That Resolution 844/19, being:

That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalitions for a term to end December 31, 2020 with expenses to be paid from General Administration Service S100:

Chair Watson
Director Jackman
Director Faust (Alternate)

be amended to include stipend and exclude Chair Watson from receiving expenses and stipend, thus reading:

That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalitions for a term to end December 31, 2020 with stipend and expenses to be paid from General Administration Service S100; AND FURTHER, the Chair not receive stipend:

Chair Watson
Director Jackman
Director Faust (Alternate)

2.2 Bylaw 2681: Land Use Amendment - Malone

The Board Report dated January 8, 2020 from Meeri Durand, Senior Project Planner, seeking a second public hearing and public information meeting for Bylaw No. 2681, has been received.

Board Meeting - December 12, 2020
Resolution No. 912/19

That the following motion BE REFERRED to the January 16, 2020 Board meeting:

That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading;

AND THAT, adoption of RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 be withheld until such a time Provincial Approval under Section 52 of the Transportation Act has been obtained.
RECOMMENDATION:
(PO RURAL)

That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be REFERRED to a second PUBLIC HEARING and public information meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:
(PO RURAL)

That in accordance with Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015, Electoral Area F Director Tom Newell is hereby delegated the authority to chair the Public Hearing on behalf of the Regional District Board.

3. COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONS

3.1 FOR INFORMATION

Committee/Commission Reports for information have been received as follows:

3.1.1 Area A Economic Development Commission: minutes December 3, 2019

3.1.2 Area C - Planning Advisory Committee: minutes December 9, 2019

Staff has received the recommendations and is working with the Commission.

3.1.3 Castlegar & District Community Complex & Recreation Commission: minutes January 8, 2020

3.2 WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2.1 Recreation Commission No. 4: minutes November 12, 2019

RECOMMENDATION:
(PO WGT)

That the Board approve the payment of the following grants from the Recreation Commission No. 4 Service S228 2019 budget:

Nakusp Ski Hill Association $1,300

3.2.2 Recreation Commission No. 7: minutes December 2, 2019

RECOMMENDATION:
(PO WGT)

That the Board approve the payment of the following grants from the Recreation Commission No. 7 – Salmo and Area G Service
S230, 2019 budget:

Salmo Ski Club $1,800
Salmo Community Resource Society $2,612

3.2.3 Riondel Commission of Management: minutes December 3, 2019

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board approve the purchase of a new Brother Colour Laser printer for the Riondel Commission of Management in the amount of $500 plus tax to be paid from Recreation Facility-Area A (Riondel) Service S209.

3.2.4 New Denver, Silverton, Slocan and Area H Economic Development Commission: minutes December 5, 2019

RECOMMENDATION:
(PO WGT)
That the Board approve the payment of the following invoices from Economic Development – New Denver, Silverton, Slocan and Area H Service S114:

- Valley Voice Ad $9.45
- Sharon Butler, Secretary $250 (October – November)

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board send a letter of support to Kootenay Adaptive Sport Association who are applying for a job creation grant to replace aging boardwalks at the Winlaw Regional and Nature Park.

3.2.5 Creston Valley Services Committee: minutes January 9, 2020

The minutes of the Creston Valley Services Committee meeting held January 9, 2020 will be received in the addenda package.

3.2.6 Joint Resource Recovery Committee: minutes January 15, 2020

The minutes of the Joint Resources Recovery Committee meeting held January 15, 2020 will be received in the addenda package.

3.3 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

3.3.1 Director Jackman: Mercer - Celgar Presentation

3.3.2 Director Hewat: FCM Advocacy Days

4. MEMBERSHIP
4.1  Riondel Commission of Management

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)

That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Riondel Commission of Management for a term to end December 31, 2021:

Garth Saunders
Gerald Panino
Wade Wensink

AND FURTHER, the Board send a letter to outgoing member Ross Shears thanking him for his service to the RDCK.

4.2  Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)

That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission for a term to end December 31, 2022:

Mike Koolen (Slocan)

4.3  Recreation Commission No. 6

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)

That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Recreation Commission No. 6 for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Arlene Yofonoff (Councillor Silverton)
Tanya Gordon (Alternate Councillor Silverton)
Eva Shandro (Silverton Resident)
Monique Wood (Alternate Silverton Resident)

5.  2020 APPOINTMENTS - EXTERNAL COMMITTEES

5.1  Treaty Advisory Committee - Ktunaxa/Kinbasket

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)

The Board appoints the following Directors to the Ktunaxa Treaty Advisory Committee with a term expiring December 31, 2020:

Director _________
Director _________ (Alternate)
That the Board approve the stipend and expenses for Director(s) _______ to attend the Ktunaxa/Kinbasket Advisory Committee be paid from General Administration Services S100.

5.2 West Kootenay Transit Committee

RECOMMENDATION:

(ALL VOTE)

The Board appoints the following Directors to the West Kootenay Transit Committee (excluding Directors for Electoral Area B and C and the Town of Creston) with the term to end December 31, 2020, with stipends and usual expenses to be paid from the Transit-Kootenay Lake West S239:

Director Tassone
Director ________________
Director ________________
Director ________________ (Alternate)

6. CORRESPONDENCE

6.1 The email dated December 11, 2019 from Nadine Reynolds, Columbia Headwaters Program, seeking partners in the Columbia Headwaters region of BC. 118 - 151

6.2 The email dated December 19, 2019 from the BC Active Transportation Grants Program announcing the opening of redesigned grant program to boost active transportation. 152

6.3 The letter dated December 6, 2019 from Dan Jepsen, C3 Alliance Corp., inviting RDCK Directors to the 17th Annual BC Natural Resources Forum on January 28 - 30, 2020. 153

7. COMMUNICATIONS

7.1 The letter dated November 25, 2019 from Selina Robinson, Ministry of Citizens' Services, thanking Director Casemore for meeting with the Ministry during the 2019 UBCM Convention regarding the lack of cellular service along the Kootenay Pass. 154 - 155

7.2 The meeting summary dated November 26, 2019 from the Kootenay Forest Sector Collaboration provided details of the meeting. 156 - 161

7.3 The letter dated November 27, 2019 from Maja Tait, UBCM, advising the RDCK of the second Community Works Fund payment for fiscal 2019/2020. 162
7.4 The letter dated December 3, 2019 from Greg Hand, Kootenay Lake Hospital, requesting improvement to active transportation in the Nelson and Area.

7.5 The letter dated December 5, 2019 from Jay Chalke, Ombudsperson, providing the Quarterly Report for July 1 - September 30, 2019.

7.6 The letter dated December 5, 2019 from Peter Ronald, Local Government Program Services, advising that the RDCK will receive final payment of $22,500 for the Community Wildfire Protection Plan project.

7.7 The letter dated December 12, 2019 from Michelle Mungall, Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, thanking Chair Watson for meeting with the Ministry during the 2019 UBCM Convention regarding the HB facility closure and reclamation.

7.8 The letter dated December 18, 2019 from John Jack, Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District, requesting the Province expedite the $10 a day Child Care Plan.

7.9 The letter dated December 18, 2019 from George Heyman, Ministry of Environment Climate Change Strategy, responding to the letter sent regarding inclusion of packaging and paper products from industrial, commercial and institutional sector in regulations.

8. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)

The Accounts Payable Summary for December 2019 in the amount of $3,122,451 be approved.

9. BYLAWS

9.1 Bylaw 2679 & 2680: Land Use Amendment - Area K Block

The Board Report dated January 3, 2020 from Dana Hawkins, Planner, seeking Board consider multiple text and land use amendments to the Electoral Area K - The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 and RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004, has been received.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(PO RURAL)

That the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 is hereby given THIRD reading by content.
That the *Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019* being a bylaw to amend the *Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004* is hereby given THIRD reading by content.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That adoption of *RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019* be withheld until such a time a new water license application from Front Counter BC for the purposes of Industrial sub-purpose - Greenhouse/Nursery for Lot 10, District Lot 4274, Kootenay District Plan 1123 (PID 014-858-941) has been obtained.

### 9.2 Bylaw 2690: Land Use Amendment - Derco

The Board Report dated December 20, 2019 from Eileen Senyk, Planner, seeking Board approval to adopt RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019, has been received.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That *Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019* being a bylaw to amend *Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004* is hereby ADOPTED; AND FURTHER that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

### 9.3 Bylaw 2691: Special Events Permit Service Establishment

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the *Regional District of Central Kootenay Special Events Permit Service Establishment Bylaw No. 2691, 2019* be ADOPTED and the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

### 10. NEW BUSINESS

#### 10.1 COMMUNITY SERVICES

##### 10.1.1 Campbell Field Feasibility Fund Request

The Board Report dated December 20, 2019 from Joe Chirico, General Manager of Community Services, is recommending to the Board a Feasibility Fund project to investigate the feasibility of a new recreation service to deliver regional community facilities/services to the residents of either of all, a portion or none of the Areas, E, F, H, I, J and the municipalities of Castlegar, Nelson and Slocan, has been received.
RECOMMENDATION:
(PO WGT)
That the Board approve $95,000 be included in the 2020 Financial Plan to fund the Campbell Field Feasibility Study with $80,000 to be funded from the RDCK Feasibility Study Reserve Fund and the remaining $15,000 be funded from the Area H South Recreation Service S231; AND FURTHER, that RC Strategies be retained at a cost not to exceed $55,608 plus applicable taxes to complete Campbell Field Feasibility Services.

10.1.2 Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission: Resolution 698/19
Board Meeting - October 17, 2019
Resolution No. 698/19

That the Regional District Board write a letter to the Director of Recreation Sites & Trails BC advising that the Castlegar & District Community Complex & Recreation Commission encourages and values meaningful collaboration with all stakeholders consistent with our Recreation & Cultural Masterplan;

AND FURTHER, that the letter be reviewed by the Board prior to being sent.

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board send a letter to the Director of Recreation Sites & Trails BC advising that the Castlegar & District Community Complex & Recreation Commission encourages and values meaningful collaboration with all stakeholders consistent with our Recreation & Culture Masterplan.

10.2 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

10.2.1 Unsightly Property - Remedial Action Requirement
The Board Report dated December 23, 2019 from Pamela Guille, Bylaw Enforcement Officer, seeking Board approval from remedial action on property legally described as Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District, has been received.

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board RESCIND resolutions 832/19 and 833/19.

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board order Mr. Desmond L. Penny to meet compliance with the Unsightly Property Bylaw No. 1687, 2004 within sixty (60) days; and that, if the work is not completed within the sixty (60) day timeline, the Board authorize Bylaw Enforcement to enter onto the property located at 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC, Electoral Area F and legally described as Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District, with a contractor to remove all offending matter with all cost incurred by the RDCK being billed to the owner of the property, identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny.

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That the Board approve all cost incurred by the RDCK be added to the property taxes as taxes in arrears should the property owner identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny not pay the bill by December 31st of the year the clean up occurred on 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC and legally described as Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District;

AND FURTHER, that all costs be charged to S288 Untidy and Unsightly Properties, Electoral Area F.

10.2.2 Z241 Park Model Homes

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That it is the policy of the Board in regard to the electoral areas of the Regional District of Central Kootenay to permit recreational vehicles certified as CSA Z241 Park Model Trailers for temporary accommodation for the travelling public on all lands where recreational vehicles are permitted, including areas where recreational vehicle parks and campgrounds are permitted, provided that the regional district may in its discretion take action to prohibit occupancy of CSA Z241 Park Model Trailers as dwelling units;

AND FURTHER, that this resolution supersedes and replaces resolution No. 73/17 (IC93/16) passed December 8, 2016 and Resolution No. 417/17 (IC43/17) passed June 15, 2017.

10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

10.3.1 Linear Infrastructure Construction Crew Evaluation

The Board Report dated December 16, 2019 from Steve Ethier, Water Operations Manager, seeking Board approval for the formation of an in-house capital works linear assets construction crew, has been received.
RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That staff be directed to establish an equipped construction crew including hiring of a site superintendent, labourer and equipment operator, and purchasing of an excavator, service trucks, portable office, and all associated equipment with a capital budget not to exceed $355,100 in 2021;

AND FURTHER, that a dedicated allocation service be created in the 2021 financial plan.

10.4 FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION

10.4.1 2020 Age Friendly Communities Program Grant Funding: East Shore Transportation Society

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That the RDCK support, and apply for a Stream 1 2020 Age Friendly Communities Program Grant through UBCM on behalf of the East Shore Transportation Society for planning and coordination activities to support local transportation for seniors and others with mobility challenges;

AND FURTHER, that should the grant application be successful, the Board approve the RDCK providing overall grant management services.

10.4.2 Letter of Support: Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)

That the RDCK Board write a letter to Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation in support of applications to the Connecting BC and Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission Broadband Fund programs for the purposes of building backbone fibre from Fruitvale, via Salmo to Nelson;

AND FURTHER, that the Board approve Director Cunningham writing a letter to Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation committing up to $365,040 of Area G Community Works Funding to the project, should the applications be successful.

10.4.3 Agreements: Transit Minor Betterments

10.4.3.1 Agreement: West Kootenay District - Transit Minor Betterments
RECOMMENDATION: (ALL VOTE WGT)
That the Board approve the RDCK enter into a agreement with Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure - West Kootenay District for the Transit Minor Betterments program for the period to end March 31, 2020, and that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

10.4.3.2 Agreement: Spearhead - Bus Shelters

RECOMMENDATION: (ALL VOTE WGT)
That the Board approve the RDCK enter into a agreement with Spearhead for bus shelters as part of the Transit Minor Betterments program for the period to end April 2020, and that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

10.4.4 Mercer - Celgar Presentation

RECOMMENDATION: (ALL VOTE)
That the Board approve the stipend and expenses for the Directors who attended the Mercer - Celgar presentation on January 7, 2020; and that, it be paid from General Administration Service S100.

10.4.5 For Discussion: Draft Letters of Support Policy No. 100-03-08 331 - 333
The draft Letter of Support Policy 100-03-08 has been received for discussion.

10.4.6 Policy: RDCK Applying for Grants - External Organizations

RECOMMENDATION: (ALL VOTE)
That the Board direct staff to prepare a policy in regards to RDCK applying for grant funding on behalf of external organizations.

10.4.7 For Information: 2019 RDCK Quarterly Reporting (Q4) 334 - 365
The 2019 RDCK Quarterly Report (Q4) from Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer, has been received.

10.5 FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES

10.5.1 UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF): 366 - 369
Emergency Support Services IT Equipment
The Board Report dated December 19, 2019 from Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager, seeking Board direction to submit an application for the 2020 stream of UBCM CEPF funding to purchase Emergency Support Service IT equipment, has been received.

RECOMMENDATION:
(PO WGT)
That Board direct staff to apply to the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) Emergency Support Services stream to purchase three (3) complete IT kits consisting of five (5) devices each and, provide training for Emergency Support Services volunteers on the use of the devices and the new on line registration forms.

10.5.2 Wildfire Mitigation Community Development Grants
The Board Report dated January 1, 2020 from Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager, providing the Board with information regarding the final totals of the community development grants each electoral area has committed to wildfire mitigation projects since 2017, has been received.

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board direct staff to transfer funds from Community Development Grant funds as per previous Board resolutions to support wildfire fuel mitigation work to Service A101 as per the Board Report - Wildfire Mitigation Community Development Grants dated January 1, 2020 from Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager.

10.5.3 For Information: Emergency Program Act Modernization
The Board Report dated January 1, 2020 from Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager, providing the Board with information regarding the provincial project to modernize the Emergency Program Act, has been received.

10.6 GRANTS

10.6.1 Discretionary

10.6.1.1 Discretionary Grants

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
Discretionary grants out of the funds available for the following Electoral Areas/Member Municipalities be approved as designated:

**AREA A**
Kootenay Employment Services Society $500

**AREA B**
Creston Valley Rod & Gun $1,500
Creston Valley Shrine Club (Fishing Derby) $500
Creston Valley Shrine Club (Travel) $1,000
Kootenay Employment Services $1,000

**AREA C**
Casey’s Community House (Creston Valley Hospital) $500
Creston Valley Shrine Club (Travel) $1,000

**AREA D**
RDCK (Area D Ads-Remembrance Day & Christmas) $75.60
RDCK (Area D Ads-Remembrance Day & Christmas) $91.35

**AREA E**
Kutenai Art Therapy Institute $500
Nelson Community Food Centre $1,000
Nelson Special Olympics (Bowling Team) $250
Our Daily Bread $1,000

**AREA F**
Friends of Kootenay Lake $1,000
Nelson Special Olympics (Bowling Team) $250

10.6.1.2 **Discretionary Grant: Resolution 468/19**

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)
That Resolution 468/19, being the allocation of Discretionary Grant funds:

**AREA F**
RDCK (Area E APC - BCUC) $5,000
BE RESCINDED.

10.6.2 **Community Development**

**RECOMMENDATION:**
(ALL VOTE)
Community Development grants out of the funds available for
the following Electoral Areas/Member Municipalities be approved as designated:

**AREA B**
Tilted Brick Gallery Association $2,000

**AREA D**
RDCK Service S184 (Mosquito) $20,000

**AREA I**
Castlegar Snowmobile Association $2,500
West Kootenay Eco-Society $2,500

**AREA J**
Castlegar & District Hospital Foundation $3,000
Kootenay Gallery of Art, History and Science $2,000

**AREA K**
Edgewood Volunteer Fire Department $500
Fauquier Community Club $1,207.50

**SLOCAN**
Village of Slocan (Waterfront Design Plan) $4,830

### 10.6.3 Community Works

#### 10.6.3.1 Community Works Funds: Clayton Creek Improvement District

The letter dated December 17, 2019 from Tom Newell, Director - Electoral Area E, rescinding Resolution No. 667/14, has been received.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

(ALL VOTE)

That Resolution No. 667/14, being the allocation of Community Works funds:

**AREA F**
Clayton Creek Improvement District $46,000

BE RESCINDED.

#### 10.6.3.2 Community Works Funds:

**RECOMMENDATION:**

(ALL VOTE)

That Resolution No. 485/17, being the allocation of Community Works funds:

**AREA D**
Woodbury Village Water System $15,000
10.6.4 Castlegar & District Youth Centre-Areas I and J Service S216: Take a Hike Youth at Risk Foundation

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the Board approve a payment of $5,000 to the Take a Hike, Youth at Risk Foundation from Castlegar & District Youth Centre-Areas I and J Service S216 to support the foundation's at-risk youth programming and partnership with School District No. 20 (Kootenay-Columbia).

11. RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
The minutes of the Rural Affairs Committee meeting held December 11, 2019 will be received in the addenda package.

12. PUBLIC TIME
The Chair will call for questions from the public and members of the media at 11:45 a.m.

13. IN CAMERA

13.1 RESOLUTION - MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
In the opinion of the Board - and in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter - the public interest so requires that persons other than DIRECTORS, ALTERNATE DIRECTORS, DELEGATIONS AND STAFF be excluded from the meeting; AND FURTHER, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter, the meeting is to be closed on the bases identified in the following subsections:

(c) labour relations or other employee relations;
(m) a matter that, under another enactment, is such that the public may be excluded from the meeting;
(n) the consideration of whether a council meeting should be closed under a provision of this subsection or subsection (2);

13.2 RESOLUTION - RECESS OF OPEN MEETING

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
The Open Meeting be recessed at _______ a.m./ p.m. in order to conduct the the In Camera Board meeting and reconvened at _______
14. MATTERS ARISING FROM IN CAMERA MEETING

15. ADJOURNMENT

RECOMMENDATION:
(ALL VOTE)
That the meeting adjourn at ___ p.m.
The twelfth meeting of the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay in 2019 was held on Thursday, December 12, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. in the RDCK Boardroom, 202 Lakeside Drive, Nelson, BC.

Quorum was maintained throughout the meeting.

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:**

**ELECTORAL AREAS**
- Chair A. Watson Area D
- Director G. Jackman Area A
- Director A. Casemore Area C
- Director R. Faust Area E
- Director T. Newell Area F
- Director H. Cunningham Area G
- Director W. Popoff Area H
- Director A. Davidoff Area I
- Director R. Smith Area J
- Director P. Peterson Area K

**MUNICIPALITIES**
- Director B. Tassone City of Castlegar
- Director R. Toyota Town of Creston
- Director S. Hewat Village of Kaslo
- Director J. Hughes Village of Nakusp
- Director B. Anderson City of Nelson
- Director C. Moss Village of New Denver
- Director D. Lockwood Village of Salmo
- Director L. Main Village of Silverton – by phone
- Director J. Lunn Village of Slocan

**DIRECTORS ABSENT**
- Director T. Wall Area B
- Director J. Morrison City of Nelson

**STAFF PRESENT**
- S. Horn Chief Administrative Officer/Chief Financial Officer
- A. Lund Deputy Corporate Officer
- M. Morrison Manager of Corporate Administration
- S. Sudan General Manager of Development Services
- U. Wolf General Manager of Environmental Services
- J. Chirico General Manager of Community Services
- C. Saari-Heckley Human Resources Manager
- N. Hannon Regional Fire Chief
- N. Wight Planning Manager
- A. Wilson Resource Recovery Manager
1. CALL TO ORDER & WELCOME

Chair Watson called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

On behalf of the Staff and the Board, Chair Watson expressed the RDCK’s deepest sympathy to the family of former Director John Voykin, Electoral Area I, and took a moment of silence.

Chair Watson welcomed Director Anderson to the Board meeting.

1.1 TRADITIONAL LANDS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

We acknowledge and respect the indigenous peoples within whose traditional lands we are meeting today.

1.2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

842/19

The agenda for the December 12, 2019 Regular Open Board meeting be adopted with the following amendments:

- removal of Item 3.1.6 Riondel Commission of Management: minutes December 3, 2019;
- inclusion of Item 7.2 City of Castlegar: Septic Handling Facility - Letter of Support;
- removal of Item 11.4.3 Service Agreement: Community Futures - Slocan Valley Economic Development Program; and
- the addition of the addendum

before circulation.

Carried

1.3 ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

843/19

The minutes from the November 21, 2019 Regular Open Board meeting be adopted as circulated.

Carried

1.4 INTRODUCTION

No introductions.

2. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

2.1 The letter dated October 10, 2019 from Michelle Ward, CANFOR, providing the dates for the Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalition.

The Director’s Report dated November 26, 2019 from Garry Jackman, Electoral Area A, providing the summary notes from the meeting to collaborate for a thriving forestry sector in the Kootenays, has been received.

Board Meeting - November 21, 2019
Resolution 780/19

That the following motion BE REFERRED to the December 12, 2019 Board meeting:

That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalitions for a term to end December 31, 2020 with expenses to be paid from General Administration Service S100:
Regional District of Central Kootenay  
December 12, 2019  

Chair Watson  
Director _____________ (Alternate) 

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

844/19  
That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Kootenay Timber Supply Area Coalitions for a term to end December 31, 2020 with expenses to be paid from General Administration Service S100:  
Chair Watson  
Director Jackman  
Director Faust (Alternate)  
Carried

3. COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONS  
3.1 FOR INFORMATION
Committee/Commission Reports for information have been received as follows: 

3.1.1 Recreation Commission No. 7: minutes September 30, 2019

3.1.2 Riondel Commission of Management: minutes November 5, 2019

3.1.3 Area C - Planning Advisory Committee: minutes November 6, 2019  
Staff has received the recommendations and is working with the Commission.

3.1.4 Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission: minutes November 21, 2019  
Staff has received the recommendation and is working with the Commission.

3.1.5 Castlegar and District Community Complex and Recreation Commission: minutes November 29, 2019

3.1.6 Riondel Commission of Management: minutes December 3, 2019  
Item removed.

3.1.7 West Resource Recovery Committee: minutes December 9, 2019

3.1.8 Central Resource Recovery Committee: minutes December 9, 2019  
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

845/19  
That in response to the November 13, 2019 letter from the City of Nelson regarding Refuse Disposal Service S187 - Curbside Recycling Collection the Board direct staff to reaffirm the impact of financial, staffing and other resources on the Central Resource Recovery Service for recycling, and based on these reviews a policy be developed to address fees and taxation for those communities providing their own recycling collection service;  
AND FURTHER, the policy be implemented post transition to Recycle BC, and known Industrial, Commercial and Institutional program.  
Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:
That the Board direct staff to proceed with the 2019 Scope of Work to delineate contaminants at 70 Lakeside Drive at a cost of $27,000 for the investigation of hydrocarbon impacts associated with the former landfill;

AND FURTHER, that the Board commit to the closure of 70 Lakeside Drive to industrial land standards, at an estimated cost of $740,000;

AND FURTHER, that the Board direct staff to proceed with meetings with CP Rail and the Ministry of Environment to discuss expanded areas for closure outside of the 70 Lakeside Drive property boundary and that staff bring a report back to the Central Resource Recovery Committee to outline expectations for closure of areas outside of 70 Lakeside Drive, and to provide information to the Committee regarding costs and responsibilities to each party.

Carried

3.1.9 Nelson and District Recreation Commission No. 5: minutes December 10, 2019

3.2 WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

3.2.1 Recreation Commission No. 10: minutes November 4, 2019
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Board approve the following grants from the Recreation Commission No. 10, Service S279, for the 2019 Budget year:

- Balfour Recreation Commission: $490
- Balfour Seniors Branch 120 (Bowling): $500
- Balfour Seniors Branch 120 (Yoga): $465
- Harrop & District Community Center Society: $900
- Harrop Procter Community Cooperative: $1,000
- Nelson Nordic Ski club: $770
- Redfish Parent Advisory Committee: $1,500
- Procter Harrop Seniors Association No. 118: $1,000

Carried

3.2.2 Area A Economic Development Commission: minutes November 5, 2019
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Resolution 799/18, being:

That the Board approve grant funding in the amount of $7,000 to South Kootenay Lake Community Services Society (SKLCSS) to support short-term operations and development planning from Economic Development - Area A Service S107 contingent on SKLCSS providing a progress report in January and March of 2019;

BE RESCINDED.

Carried

3.2.3 Recreation Commission No. 8: minutes November 6, 2019
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Slocan & Valley South Regional Parks and Recreation Commission No. 8 for a term to end December 31, 2021:

Phillip Chernenkoff  (Area H)
JoAnn Chatten  (Area H)

Carried

West Kootenay Transit Committee: minutes November 18, 2019

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Board direct staff to perform an analysis of transit service levels on a jurisdictional level.

Carried

East Resource Recovery Committee: minutes November 25, 2019

NOTE: Staff has indicated the following correction will need to be made to the East Resource Recovery minutes and to the recommendation:

That the Board accept the sole source procurement of the Creston Landfill Operations and Maintenance Contract;

AND FURTHER, that the Board direct staff to award the Creston Operations and Maintenance Contract to Alpine Disposal & Recycling Interior Division Ltd. for a 5 year term commencing April 1, 2020, with the ability to extend for two one year periods, with annual funds of $371,640, excluding GST;

AND FURTHER, that the cost be included in the 2020-2024 Financial Plan for Service S186 East Resource Recovery;

AND FURTHER, that the Chair and Corporate Officer are authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Board accept the sole source procurement of the Creston Landfill Operations and Maintenance Contract;

AND FURTHER, that the Board direct staff to award the Creston Operations and Maintenance Contract to Alpine Disposal & Recycling Interior Division Ltd. for a 5 year term commencing April 1, 2020, with the ability to extend for two one year periods, with annual funds of $371,640, excluding GST;

AND FURTHER, that the cost be included in the 2020-2024 Financial Plan for Service S186 East Resource Recovery;

AND FURTHER, that the Chair and Corporate Officer are authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
That the East Sub-Region Mixed Waste Rate, in Resource Recovery Facilities Regulatory Bylaw No. 2694, 2019, Schedule A-3, be set at $95/tonne for the 2020 budget year.

Carried

3.2.6 South Slocan Commission of Management: minutes November 28, 2019

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Board direct staff to prepare a contract with Cover Architectural Collaborative Inc. for up to $3,740 plus GST for the architectural evaluation of the South Slocan Old School House in Recreation Facility-Area H (South Slocan) Service S214; SUBJECT TO the funding being secured.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Board direct staff to adjust the 2020 budget for Water Utility - Area H (South Slocan) Service S245 to reflect a 10% increase instead of 5% for water users fees.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Board appoint the following individuals to the South Slocan Commission of Management for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Members
Peter Wood
Gary Niminiken
Kathy Loxam
Ian McGovern
Ruby Payne
Ben Euerby

Alternates
Colin Payne (for Ruby Payne)
Jake Van Camp (for Ben Euerby)
Stacey Throop (for Ian McGovern)
Cyndy Lawrence (for Peter Wood & Kathy Loxam)
Wendy Niminiken (for Gary Niminiken)

AND FURTHER, the Board send a letter to outgoing members Ann Wood, Fred Makortoff and Greg Veenstra thanking them for their service to the RDCK.

Carried

3.2.7 Castlegar and District Community Complex and Recreation Commission: minutes December 3, 2019

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the following motion BE REFERRED back to staff to provide a report on RDCK Policies, obtain a Legal opinion to ensure that Human Rights Legislation is not
being violated, and present back to the Commission at the next meeting of the Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission:

That the Board approve the RDCK entering into a Facility Use Agreement with the Mighty Men's Conference for the 2020 Vision Conference at Pass Creek Regional Park for the period July 31 to August 2, 2020, subject to legal opinion, to ensure no RDCK Policy’s or Human Rights violations are taking place.

Carried

3.2.8 Creston Valley Services Committee: minutes December 5, 2019

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

857/19 That staff be directed to include $79,000 in the 2020 Financial Plan for Service S210 Regional parks – Creston and Areas B and C, to identify a suitable location to develop a Regional Park near the Goat River.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

858/19 That the Board approve the purchase of a Kubota F3990 Tractor and attachments from Kemlee Equipment Ltd. and authorizes up to $39,944.23 plus applicable taxes be borrowed under Section 403 of the Local Government Act, from the Municipal Finance Authority;

AND FURTHER, that the loan be repaid within 5 years with no rights of renewal.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

859/19 That the Board appoint John Chisamore as the Regional District of Central Kootenay representative on the Creston Valley Community Forest Board of Directors for a term to end December 31, 2021.

Carried

3.2.9 Community Sustainable Living Advisory Committee: minutes December 10, 2019

The proposed meeting dates from the Community Sustainable Living Advisory Committee have been added to the 2020 RDCK calendar for approval.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

860/19 That the Board approve the RDCK entering into a Shared Cost Agreement with the Fraser Basin Council for Procter Hall Energy Efficiency and Solar Project for the period of December 12, 2019 to December 31, 2020, AND that, the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
861/19 That the Board direct staff to distribute the 2019 RDCK State of Climate Action full report and summary handout to the public.

Carried

3.2.10 Joint Resource Recovery Committee: minutes December 11, 2019

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

862/19 That the **Regional District of Central Kootenay Resource Recovery Facilities Regulatory Bylaw No. 2635, 2018** be REPEALED; AND FURTHER that the **Regional District of Central Kootenay Resource Recovery Facilities Regulatory Bylaw No. 2694, 2019** be read a third time.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

863/19 That the **Regional District of Central Kootenay Resource Recovery Facilities Regulatory Bylaw No. 2694, 2019** be adopted and the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

864/19 That the Board approve the RDCK enter in a service agreement with ReCollect Systems in the amount of $2,950 for the provision of the Waste Wizard app hosted on the RDCK website for the period of one year with the option to extend for further one-year periods, and that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents;

AND FURTHER, that the funds for this agreement be paid for from service A102 Resource Recoveries.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

865/19 That the Board direct Staff to develop and issue a Request for Proposal for collecting and transporting recyclable materials collected at satellite depot locations to the nearest core depot or consolidation facility.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

866/19 That the Board direct staff to develop and issue a Request for Proposal for the collection, transportation and marketing of Industrial, Commercial and Institutional old corrugated cardboard from the Nelson, Ootschening, Creston, Crescent Valley, New Denver, Nakusp, Kaslo and Salmo depot locations.
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

867/19
That the Board direct staff to allocate additional salary and benefit funds up to $28,500 in the 2020-2021 Financial Plan for Service S188 West Subregion Resource Recovery for Waste and Recycling Educators and that funds up to $48,000 be allocated to this service starting in 2022;

AND FURTHER, that the waste screening program be reviewed at the end of 2021.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

868/19
That the Board direct staff to allocate additional salary and benefit funds up to $18,000 in the 2020-2021 Financial Plan for Service S187 Central Subregion Resource Recovery for Waste and Recycling Educators and that funds up to $31,000 be allocated to this service starting in 2022.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

869/19
That the Board direct staff to allocate additional salary and benefit funds up to $18,000 in the 2020-2021 Financial Plan for Service S186 East Subregion Resource Recovery for Waste and Recycling Educators and that funds up to $34,000 be allocated to this service starting in 2022; AND FURTHER that the waste screening program be reviewed at the end of 2021.

Carried

3.3 DIRECTORS' REPORTS
3.3.1 Chair Watson: 2019 Fall - Area D Newsletter
3.3.2 Director Lockwood: 100% Renewable Kootenay Working Group

4. MEMBERSHIPS
4.1 Area A Economic Development Commission
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

870/19
That the Board send a letter to outgoing member Marg Durnin thanking her for her service to the Area A Economic Development Commission.

Carried

4.2 Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission
Silvertown’s appointments are attached to Item 4.7.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

871/19
That the Board take no further action on the following motion:
That the Board appoint the following individual to the Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission for the term to end December 31, 2020:

Barbara Furher

Carried

4.3 Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

872/19
That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission for a term to end December 31, 2021:

Rod Reitmeier (Area H)
Scott Kipkie (Area H)

Carried

4.4 Sunshine Bay Regional Park Commission
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

873/19
That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Sunshine Bay Regional Park Commission for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Lorie Dosenberger
Elaine Beaulac
Scott Gain
Ruth Prosser
Ken Foot
Ashlie Dejong

Carried

4.5 Winlaw Regional and Nature Park Commission
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

874/19
That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Winlaw Regional and Nature Park Commission for a term to end December 31, 2021:

Victoria Carleton (Area H)
JoAnn Chatten (Area H)
Dustin Thiele (Area H)

Carried

4.6 Castlegar and District Community Complex and Recreation Commission
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

875/19
That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Castlegar and District Community Complex and Recreation Commission for a term to end December 31, 2022:

Councillor Bergen Price
Councillor Dan Rye
4.7 Recreation Commission No. 2
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

876/19 That the Board appoint the following individual to the Recreation Commission No. 2 for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Dawn Lang (SD8 Representative)

Carried

4.8 Recreation Commission No. 6
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

877/19 That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Recreation Commission No. 6 for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Councillor Gerald Wagner (New Denver)
Councillor John Fyke (Alternate - New Denver)
Daniel Hellyer (Alternate - New Denver Community Representative)
Councillor Arlene Yofonoff (Silverton)
Councillor Tanya Gordon (Alternate - Silverton)

Carried

4.9 Recreation Commission No. 7
School District No. 8’s appointments are attached to Item 4.6.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

878/19 That the Board appoint the following individual to the Recreation Commission No. 7 for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Susan Chew (SD8 Representative)

Carried

4.10 Recreation Commission No. 8
School District No. 8’s appointments are attached to Item 4.6.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

879/19 That the Board appoint the following individual to the Recreation Commission No. 8 for a term to end December 31, 2020:

Sharon Nazaroff (SD8 Representative)

Carried

4.11 Recreation Commission No. 10
School District No. 8’s appointments are attached to Item 4.6.
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

880/19

That the Board appoint the following individuals to the Recreation Commission No. 10 for a term to end December 31, 2021:

Bill MacPherson
Lisa Norris
Nicole Dickieson
Jenny Hide
Margaret Gray (Alternate)
Ellen Schmidt
Kim Palfenier
Lenora Trenaman (SD8 Representative) - term to end December 31, 2020

Carried

5. 2020 APPOINTMENTS - EXTERNAL COMMITTEES

5.1 Columbia Basin Regional Advisory Committee (CBRAC)

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

881/19

That the Board take no further action on the following motion:

That the Board appoint the following Director to the Columbia Basin Regional Advisory Committee for a term to end December 2021, with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100:

Director ______________________

Carried

5.2 Emergency Program Executive Committee

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

882/19

That the Board appoint the following Director to the Emergency Program Executive Committee, as per Bylaw 2210, for a term to end October 2022:

Director Moss (Areas H, I, J, K, Nakusp, Silverton, New Denver, Slocan, Castlegar);
AND FURTHER, that the members of said committee receive expenses only to be paid from General Administration Service S100.

Carried

5.3 Kaslo & District Community Forest Society Board

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

883/19

That the Board appoint the following individual to the Kaslo and District Community Forest Society Board for a term to end December 2020:

Neil Johnson (Area D)

Carried
5.4 **Municipal Finance Authority**

*Moved* and seconded,  
And Resolved:

884/19 That the Board appoint the following Directors as representatives to the Municipal Finance Authority for a term to end December 2020, with stipends and usual expenses to be paid from General Administration Service $100:

- Director Toyota  
- Director Hewat (Alternate)

*Carried*

5.5 **Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia**

*Moved* and seconded,  
And Resolved:

885/19 That the Board appoint the following Directors as representatives to the Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia for a term to end December 2020:

- Director Davidoff  
- Director Casemore (Alternate)

*Carried*

5.6 **Nelson Public Library Board**

*Moved* and seconded,  
And Resolved:

886/19 That the Board appoint the following person as the Electoral Area F representative to the Nelson Public Library Board for a term to end December 2021:

- Annie Holtby

*Carried*

*Moved* and seconded,  
And Resolved:

887/19 That the Board appoint the following person as the Electoral Area H representative to the Nelson Public Library Board with travel expenses to be paid from Area H Library Service $200 and for a term to end December 2021:

- Randi Fjeldseth

*Carried*

5.7 **Regional Broadband Committee**

*Moved* and seconded,  
And Resolved:

888/19 That the Board appoint the Chair to represent the RDCK on the Regional Broadband Committee for a term to end December 2020, with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service $100.

*Carried*

5.8 **Selkirk College Regional Innovation Chair for Rural Economic Development**
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

889/19
That the Board hereby appoint the following Director to the Selkirk College Regional Innovation Chair for Rural Economic Development for a term to end December 2020, with stipend and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100:

Director Davidoff

Carried

5.9 Collector - Assessment Rolls
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

890/19
The Board hereby appoints Stuart Horn, Chief Financial Officer, as Collector for 2020 for the purpose of preparing and amending, as necessary, the following assessment rolls:

Lucas Road Water Parcel Tax
Voykin Street Lighting Parcel Tax
South Slocan Water Parcel Tax
Duhamel Creek Water Parcel Tax
McDonald Creek Water Parcel Tax
Balfour Water Parcel Tax
Burton Water Parcel Tax
Edgewood Water Parcel Tax
Fauquier Water Parcel Tax
West Robson Water Parcel Tax
Woodland Heights Water Parcel Tax
Woodbury Water Parcel Tax
Grandview Heights Water Parcel Tax
Sanca Park Water Frontage Tax
Riondel Water Frontage Tax
Ymir Water Frontage Tax
Rosebery Water Parcel Tax
Local Conservation Fund Service Parcel Tax (Areas A, D, E)

Carried

5.10 Election Officers
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

891/19
The Board appoints Tom Dool as Chief Election Officer for the year 2020 and Angela Lund as Deputy Chief Election Officer for the year 2020.

Carried

5.11 Parcel Tax Roll Review Panels
5.11.1 East
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

892/19
That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Parcel Tax Roll Review Panel to sit in Creston, BC with stipends and usual expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service:
Directed by: Jackman, Wall, Casemore, Toyota

Carried

5.11.2 West

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

893/19

That the Board appoint the following Directors to the Parcel Tax Roll Review Panel
to sit in Nelson, BC with stipends and usual expenses to be paid from the General
Administration Service:

Chair Watson
Director Hewat
Director Newell
Director Popoff

Carried

6. CONFERENCES

6.1 UBCM Electoral Area Directors’ Forum: February 4 - 5, 2020

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

894/19

That the Board approves the following Directors as delegates to the 2020 Electoral Area
Directors’ Forum in Richmond, BC from February 4 and 5, 2020 with stipends and
expenses to be paid from the Rural Administration Service S101:

Director Jackman
Director Wall
Director Casemore
Director Watson
Director Faust
Director Newell
Director Cunningham
Director Popoff
Director Davidoff
Director Smith
Director Peterson

Carried

Moved and seconded,
MOTION ONLY

That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to attend the 2020
UBCM Electoral Area Directors’ Forum as a delegate with expenses to be paid from the
General Administration Service S100.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION

895/19

The following motion, being:
That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to attend the 2020 UBCM Electoral Area Directors’ Forum as a delegate with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

BE AMENDED to include “and/or the Corporate Officer” after Chief Administrative Officer, thus reading:

*That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and/or the Corporate Officer to attend the 2020 UBCM Electoral Area Directors’ Forum as a delegate with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.*

Carried

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:

**MAIN MOTION**

896/19

That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and/or the Corporate Officer to attend the 2020 UBCM Electoral Area Directors’ Forum as a delegate with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

6.2 **LGLA Leadership Forum: February 5 - 7, 2020**

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:

**MAIN MOTION**

897/19

That the Board approves the following Directors as delegates to the 2020 Leadership Forum in Richmond, BC from February 5 - 7, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100:

- **Rural Directors**
  - Director Jackman
  - Director Wall
  - Director Casemore
  - Director Watson
  - Director Faust
  - Director Newell
  - Director Cunningham
  - Director Popoff
  - Director Davidoff
  - Director Smith
  - Director Peterson

- **Municipal Directors**
  - Director Tassone
  - Director Toyota
  - Director Hewat
  - Director Hughes
  - Director Morrison
  - Director Moss
  - Director Lockwood
  - Director Main
  - Director Lunn

Carried

6.3 **Association of Kootenay Boundary Local Governments (AKBLG): April 24 - 26, 2020**
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

898/19
That the Board approves the following Directors as delegates to the 2020 Association of Kootenay Boundary Local Governments Convention in Radium, BC from April 24 - 26, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the Rural Administration Service S101:

**Rural Directors**
Director Jackman
Director Wall
Director Casemore
Director Watson
Director Faust
Director Newell
Director Cunningham
Director Popoff
Director Davidoff
Director Smith
Director Peterson

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

899/19
That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and/or the Corporate Officer to attend the 2020 Association of Kootenay Boundary Local Governments Convention as a delegate with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

6.4 **Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM): June 4 - 7, 2020**
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

900/19
That the Board approves the following Directors as delegates to the 2020 Federation of Canadian Municipalities in Toronto, Ontario from June 4 - 7, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100:

**Rural Directors**
Director Jackman
Director Wall
Director Casemore
Director Watson
Director Faust
Director Newell
Director Cunningham
Director Popoff
Director Davidoff
Director Smith
Director Peterson

**Municipal Directors**
Director Tassone
Director Toyota
Director Hewat
Director Hughes
AND FURTHER, in event that a Director cannot attend the Alternate Director is not authorized to attend in their absence.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

901/19 That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer or the Corporate Officer to attend the Federation of Canadian Municipalities convention to the 2020 Federation of Canadian Municipalities in Toronto, Ontario from June 4 - 7, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

6.5 Union of BC Municipalities: September 21 - 25, 2020
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

902/19 That the Board approves the following Directors as delegates to the 2020 Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) in Victoria, BC from September 21 - 25, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100:

**Rural Directors**
Director Jackman
Director Wall
Director Casemore
Director Watson
Director Faust
Director Newell
Director Cunningham
Director Popoff
Director Davidoff
Director Smith
Director Peterson

**Municipal Directors**
Director Tassone
Director Toyota
Director Hewat
Director Hughes
Director Morrison
Director Moss
Director Lockwood
Director Main
Director Lunn

AND FURTHER, that in event that a Director cannot attend, that the Alternate Director be approved to attend.

Carried
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

903/19

That the Board authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer and/or the Corporate Officer to attend the Union of BC Municipalities convention in Victoria, BC from September 21 - 25, 2020 with expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

6.6 BC Council of Forest Industries: April 1 - 3, 2020

Moved and seconded,
MOTION ONLY

That the Board approves Chair Watson attend the 2020 BC Council of Forest Industries Annual Convention in Prince George, BC from April 1 - 3, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION

904/19

That the foregoing motion, being:

That the Board approves Chair Watson attend the 2020 BC Council of Forest Industries Annual Convention in Prince George, BC from April 1 - 3, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100;

Be amended to include “and a seconded appointment, to be determined, to” after Chair Watson, thus reading:

That the Board approves Chair Watson and a seconded appointment, to be determined, to attend the 2020 BC Council of Forest Industries Annual Convention in Prince George, BC from April 1 - 3, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:
MAIN MOTION

905/19

That the Board approves Chair Watson and a seconded appointment, to be determined, to attend the 2020 BC Council of Forest Industries Annual Convention in Prince George, BC from April 1 - 3, 2020 with stipends and expenses to be paid from the General Administration Service S100.

Carried

6.7 Rural Directors' Allowance

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

906/19

That the Board approve the rural director discretionary conference allowance for 2020 to be $2,500 per Rural Director for a total of $27,500 and that this amount be included in the 2020 Financial Plan for S101 Rural Administration;

AND FURTHER, that each Director be approved to roll forward any unspent funds as of December 31, 2019 to be available in addition to the 2020 amount;
AND FURTHER, that the Board direct staff to include the Rural Directors' Allowance in the RDCK Conference Attendance Policy.

Carried

7. CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 The email dated November 21, 2019 from George Heyman, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, thanking RDCK for meeting with him at the 2019 UBCM Convention to discuss recycling in rural areas.

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:

907/19

That the Board send a letter to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change to request a meeting with Minister Heyman early in 2020 to discuss the issues regarding inclusion of the Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional sector in the Recycle BC program.

Carried

7.2 The email dated December 4, 2019 from Patrick Gauvreau, City of Castlegar, requesting a letter of support for the Infrastructure Planning Grant for septage handling facility.

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:

908/19

That the Board send a letter of support to the City of Castlegar for their Infrastructure Planning Grant Program application to do a septage handling facility study for the North Sewage Lagoon.

Carried

8. COMMUNICATIONS

8.1 The letter dated October 31, 2019 from Rebecca Bishop, UBCM, providing the RDCK with the final payment of $66,863.21 for the Community Emergency Preparedness funding.

8.2 The letter dated November 14, 2019 from Richard Brenton, West Kootenay Woodlot Association, providing an overview of a BC Woodlot License.

8.3 The email dated November 21, 2019 from Avtar Sundher, Agricultural Land Commission, responding to the RDCK’s inquiry regarding satellite surveillance for monitoring and regulating the Agriculture Land Reserve in southwestern BC.

8.4 The letter dated November 22, 2019 from the Gar Creek Water Users Association thanking the RDCK for their support to have fresh drinking water in the area after the 2012 landslide.

9. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:

909/19

The Accounts Payable Summary for November 2019 in the amount of $3,782,798 be approved.

Carried

10. BYLAWS

10.1 Bylaw 2677: Area A Economic Development Commission

Moved and seconded,

And Resolved:
That the Economic Development Commission for Electoral Area Bylaw No. 587, 1986 be REPEALED; AND FURTHER that the Electoral Area A Economic Development Commission Bylaw No. 2677, 2019 be read a first, second and third time.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Electoral Area A Economic Development Commission Bylaw No. 2677, 2019 be ADOPTED and the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Carried

10.2 Bylaw 2681: Land Use Amendment - Malone
The Board Report dated November 18, 2019 from Meeri Durand, Senior Project Planner, seeking Board approve third reading of Bylaw No. 2681, has been received.

Director Anderson declared a conflict of interested due to due to do consultation work for cannabis cultivators and left the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the following motion BE REFERRED to the January 16, 2020 Board meeting:

That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading;

AND THAT, adoption of RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 be withheld until such a time Provincial Approval under Section 52 of the Transportation Act has been obtained.

Carried

Director Anderson returned to the meeting at 10:22 a.m.

10.3 Bylaw 2690: Land Use Amendment - Derco
The Board Report dated November 27, 2019 from Eileen Senyk, Planner, seeking Board approve third reading of Bylaw No. 2690, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be read a THIRD time by content.

Carried

10.4 Bylaw 2699: Central Sub-region Capital Projects Temporary Borrowing
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Central Sub-Region Capital Projects Temporary Borrowing Bylaw No. 2699, 2019 be read a FIRST, SECOND, and THIRD time by content.
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

915/19 That the Central Sub-Region Capital Projects Temporary Borrowing Bylaw No. 2699, 2019 be ADOPTED and the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Carried

11. NEW BUSINESS
11.1 COMMUNITY SERVICES
11.1.1 Permission of Use: Teck Metals Ltd
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

916/19 That the Board approve the RDCK entering into a Permission to Use Teck Property Agreement with Teck Metals Ltd. for the period November 5, 2019 to November 5, 2022, and that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorised to sign the necessary documents.

Carried

11.2 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
11.2.1 Regional Housing Needs Assessment Report
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

917/19 That the Board award the contract for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Report project to M’akola Development Services and Turner Drake and Partners Ltd., and that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents to a maximum value of $147,572.00 (includes GST);

AND FURTHER, that the cost be included in the 2020 Financial Plan for $147,572.00 for Planning Services S104.

Carried

11.2.2 Invasive Species Strategy for the RDCK
The Board Report dated November 20, 2019 from Paris Marshall Smith, Sustainability Coordinator, seeking Board approval for a contribution to Central Kootenay Invasive Species Society for the purpose of developing an invasive species strategy for the RDCK, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

918/19 That the Board approve a contribution in the amount of $10,000 to Central Kootenay Invasive Species Society for the purpose of developing an invasive species strategy for the RDCK properties from General Administration S100.

Carried

11.2.3 Non-Competitive Purchase Request: Risk Tolerance Policy

RECESS/RECONVENED

The meeting recessed at 10:23 a.m. and reconvened 10:37 a.m.
The Board Report dated November 29, 2019 from Sangita Sudan, General Manager of Development Services, seeking Board approval to continue partnering with BGC Engineering to access Union of British Columbia Municipality - Community Emergency Preparedness Fund to prepare a Risk Tolerance Policy, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

919/19

That staff be directed to partner with BGC Engineering to prepare an application to the January 2020 intake for the Community Emergency preparedness Fund to develop an RDCK Risk Tolerance Policy;

AND FURTHER, if successful staff be directed to enter into a non-competitive purchase agreement with BGC Engineering to develop a Risk Tolerance Policy.

Carried

11.2.4 For Information: Building Permits - October 2019
The Building Permit Summary Report dated October 2019, has been received for information.

11.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
11.3.1 Fauquier Capital Project Budget Amendment
The Board Report dated November 29, 2019 from Steve Ethier, Water Operations Manager, requesting a budget amendment for the capital project Fauquier Valve Replacement, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

920/19

That the Board of Directors approve an amendment to the 2019 Financial Plan for Water Utility-Area K (Fauquier) Service S254, Accounts 60000 and 45500 to increase the budgeted amount from $35,000 to $58,000.

Carried

11.3.2 Moratorium Status on Acquisitions of Water & Wastewater Systems
The Board Report dated November, 2019 from Uli Wolf, General Manager of Environmental Services, requesting a further six month extension of the moratorium on the intake of acquisition applications from water and wastewater systems, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

921/19

That the moratorium on the intake of acquisition applications from water and wastewater systems to become RDCK owned and operated systems be extended until June 30, 2020;

AND FURTHER, the item be brought back to the Board at the May 2020 Board meeting.

Carried

11.3.3 2020 Wood Stove Exchange Program
The Board Report dated November 26, 2019 from Rachel George, Environmental Services Administrative Assistant, seeking Board approval to enter into an
agreement with BC Lung Association for the 2020 Provincial Wood Stove Exchange Program, has been received.

Director Hughes declared a conflict due to employment at the family heat pump business and left the meeting at 10:54 a.m.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

922/19 That the Board direct staff to enter into an agreement with the BC Lung Association for the 2020 Provincial Wood Stove Exchange Program grant in the amount of $15,000.00;

AND FURTHER, that staff allocate funds to the Environmental Services Budget - Service A100 in the amount of $12,000 for the Wood Stove Exchange Program, to exchange a maximum of 50 stoves in the RDCK and to cover the cost of program promotion.

Carried

Director Hughes returned to the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

11.4 FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION
11.4.1 RDCK 2020 Meeting Calendar
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

923/19 That the Board approve the 2020 meeting calendar and direct staff to schedule budget meetings as necessary.

Carried

11.4.2 Water System Governance Options
The Board Report dated November 29, 2019 from Mike Morrison, Manager of Corporate Administration, re-introducing the Board to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Water Service Option report, has been received.

Moved and Seconded,
And Resolved:

924/19 That the Board direct staff to consider Option 1 and 2 from the Board Report dated November 29, 2019 from Mike Morrison, Manager of Corporate Administration; AND FURTHER, the following options (Option 2) identified should be evaluated:

Status Quo (with or without commission)
Separate service, water board
Sub-regional water utility (similar to sub-regional resource recovery)

Defeated

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

925/19 That the Board direct staff to bring forward a report to the Board which outlines the necessary regulatory, operational, financial and communications steps and proposed schedule for establishing a RDCK Water Supply Board as recommended

Carried

11.4.3 Service Agreement: Community Futures - Slocan Valley Economic Development Program
Item removed.

11.5 RDCK STAFFING REQUESTS
11.5.1 Community Services: Marketing and Communication position
The Board Report dated November 26, 2019 from Joe Chirico, General Manager of Community Services, seeking Board approval to fund an additional position to provide marketing and communication support, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

926/19 That Item 11.5.1 Community Services: Marketing and Communication position be tabled to accommodate the delegation, staff present and public time, with Items 14.1 Columbia Basin Trust, Item 15 Presentation of Long Term Service Awards and Item 16 Public Time considered at this time.

Carried

ORDER OF AGENDA
The Order of Business was changed to address delegations, staff and the public, CHANGED Items 14.1 Columbia Basin Trust, Item 15 Presentation of Long Term Service Awards and Item 16 Public Time were considered at this time.

14. DELEGATION(S)
14.1 Columbia Basin Trust (The Trust)
Johnny Strilaeff
President & CEO

Jocelyn Carver
CBT Board of Directors

Jocelyn Carver, CBT Board Vice Chair, introduced herself and thanked the RDCK for their hard work and the level of commitment they provide to their communities. She also thanked the RDCK for appointing former Director Larry Binks to the CBT Board. He has been a valuable member and mentor at the CBT Board table.

Johnny Strilaeff, President/CEO, and Jocelyn Carver gave a presentation to the Board regarding the Trust’s annual report for the 2018/19 year. Mr. Strilaeff provided a high-level overview of the finances and identified there were over 70 active programs and initiatives this year, the highest number ever for the Trust. He discussed the successful purchase of the Waneta Expansion and their partnership with Columbia Power Corporation to keep local ownership. He indicated the Waneta Expansion is a generational asset that will be a benefit for our children and their children in the future with over 2 billion dollars in hydro assets. He reviewed the Trust’s revenues, delivery of benefits, revenue and disbursement and identified an increase in revenue over the last 25 years.

Jocelyn addressed the core function of the Trust and their strategic priorities for the 2016-2020 term. Ms. Carver discussed the Trust’s current priorities and some of the successful project that have taken place within the communities. She indicated that the Trust would be reaching out to the communities and their partners to begin talks on determining the long-term objectives and strategic priorities for the next term.
Mr. Strilaeff circulated an information package to the Directors that included an evaluation on the Trust. He identified the Trust will be sharing the information with the communities and is hoping this will be a catalyst for the next round of strategic planning and inspire critical thinking for future projects.

In conclusion, Ms. Carver indicated the Trust is turning twenty-five years old in 2020. She spoke of the founders of the Trust and how much the organization has grown since the beginning. She encouraged partners and communities to engage in the strategic planning process to determine long-term objectives that will continue to support our families and communities. She encouraged the Board to continue to be ambassadors and continue to help the Trust grow.

Chair Watson thanked the Trust for their partnership and continued hard work within the region.

Vice-Chair Popoff thanked Mr. Strilaeff and Ms. Carver and presented them with RDCK pen and pin at 11:54 a.m.

15. PRESENTATION OF LONG TERM SERVICE AWARDS
The Board recognizes and thanks the following staff members for their long service to the RDCK:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Ambrosio</td>
<td>Castlegar &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Chirico</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam McIntosh</td>
<td>Castlegar &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Duncan</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Bennett</td>
<td>Castlegar &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Wilson</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Lund</td>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi Vousden</td>
<td>Slocan Valley Recreation Commission No.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Morrison</td>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Fediuk</td>
<td>Creston &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uli Wolf</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Burnett</td>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Drabik</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Smith</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Benson</td>
<td>Nelson &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Pilla</td>
<td>Castlegar &amp; District Community Complex</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Watson presented the long-term service awards to staff.

Chair Watson acknowledged Emergency Coordinator (Creston) Alanna Garrett for her many years of service to the RDCK.

16. PUBLIC TIME
The Chair will call for questions from the public and members of the media at 11:45 a.m.

ORDER OF AGENDA Item 11.5.1 Community Services: Marketing and Communication position was considered at this time.

11.5 RDCK STAFFING REQUESTS
11.5.1 Community Services: Marketing and Communication position
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

927/19

That the Board direct staff to include a permanent full-time Community Services Communications & Marketing Administrator in the draft 2020 Financial Plan to be paid from Service $100 and allocated as per the Community Services Fee to provide support for planning and implementing RDCK communication and marketing strategies; AND FURTHER, final approval to proceed with the staffing action BE REFERRED to the March 2020 Board meeting.

Carried

11.5.2 2020 Temporary and Summer Staff
The Board Report dated November 20, 2019 from Connie Saari-Heckley, Human Resource Manager, seeking Board approval to hire summer staff to work in Administration, Development Services and Environmental Services, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

928/19

That the Board approve the hiring of seven (7) temporary staff for terms of 16-32 weeks each, with costs to be paid from the following services in 2020, and included in the relevant financial plans:

- 1 Corporate Administration summer student at a cost of $11,000 for Service $100.
- 4 Project Site Inspectors: to be coded to each project based on the numbers of hours to be worked.
- 1 Water Operator Tech 1 for Water East, for a period of 32 weeks at a cost of $33,000 to be allocated to Riondel, Sanca, Erickson, Lister and Arrow Operations water services.
- 1 Water Operator Tech 1 for Water West for a period of 19 weeks at a cost of $19,000 to be allocated to Lucas Rd, West Robson, South Slocan, Woodland Heights, Ymir, Duhamel, Grandview, Balfour, Woodbury, Rosebery, Denver Siding, Fauquier, Burton, and Edgewood water services.

Carried

11.5.3 Environmental Services: Resource Recovery Operations
The Board Report dated November 29, 2019 from Amy Wilson, Resource Recovery Manager, seeking Board approval to hire a permanent, full time operational/technical support position for Resource Recovery, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

929/19

That the Board approve the hiring of a permanent full-time Resource Recovery Operations Coordinator in January of 2020; and that, the annual salary and benefits be $80,350, with $72,315 allocated in 2020 within A102 Resource Recovery in the 2020-2024 Financial Plan.

Carried

11.5.4 Fire Services: Staffing
The Board Report dated November 25, 2019 from Nora Hannon, Regional Fire Chief, seeking Board approval for restructuring RDCK Fire Services to enable staffing support for the RDCK Fire Department, has been received.
DIRECTOR ABSENT  Director Tassone left the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

930/19  That the Board approve the creation of a 1.0 FTE Regional Deputy Fire Chief Training and .71 FTE Regional Assistant Fire Chief Prevention with a start date of February 1, 2020, and approve changing the existing 1.0 FTE Regional Deputy Fire Chief to an Operations specific position, with a start date of February 1, 2020;

AND FURTHER, that staff be directed to amend all fire service bylaws to show the costs that each of the services are responsible for sharing in as part of the Regional Fire Service Operations.

Carried

Director Newell recorded opposed.

11.5.5 Purchasing Agent
The Board Report dated November 20, 2019 from Connie Saari-Heckley seeking Board approval to hire a purchasing agent on a permanent, full time basis, has been received.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

931/19  That the Board approve the hiring of one (1) full time, permanent Purchasing agent, with the start date to be no earlier than April 1, 2020, and with costs to be allocated to General Administration Service S100.

Carried

11.6  GRANTS

11.6.1 Discretionary

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

932/19  Discretionary grants out of the funds available for the following Electoral Areas/Member Municipalities be approved as designated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Ministerial Association</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Arts Council</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Ministerial Association</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA C</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Curling Club</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Ministerial Association</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOCAN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slocan (Xmas Hampers)</td>
<td>$425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slocan (Halloween Hoot)</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried

11.6.2 Community Development
11.6.2.1 Community Development Grants

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

933/19

Community Development grants out of the funds available for the following Electoral Areas/Member Municipalities be approved as designated:

**AREA E**
West Kootenay Eco-Society $7,500

**AREA F**
Nelson & District Seniors Coordinating Society $1,000
Taghum Community Society $2,000

**AREA G**
Kootenay Mountaineering Club $3,000
Salmo Community Services $2,000

**AREA H**
Kootenay Mountaineering Club $1,000

**AREA I**
Shoreacres Neighbourhood Community Association $250

**AREA J**
Castlegar Hospice Society $1,500
Community Harvest Food Band and Emergency Shelter $1,500
Stanley Humphries Secondary School $2,000

**AREA K**
Arrow Lakes Cross Country Ski Club $2,000
RDCK - Dog Control S182 $10,000

**SILVERTON**
Village of Silverton (facility upgrades) $14,000

**SLOCAN**
Village of Slocan (Asset Management Project) $2,500

Carried

11.6.2.2 Resolution 470/19: Rescind

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

934/19

That Resolution 470/19, being the allocation of Community Development grant funds:

**AREA E**
RDCK (Area E APC - BCUC) $5,000

BE RESCINDED.

Carried

11.6.3 Recreation Commission No. 6
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

935/19    
That Resolution 762/19, being the allocation of Recreation Commission No. 6 funds, be amended by changing:

Slocan Solutions (Weekly Seniors Activities Venue Rental) $367.50

To

New Denver/Silverton Senior Citizens Association Branch No. 87 (Weekly Seniors Activities Venue Rental) $367.50

Carried

11.6.4 Rural Dividend Funds: South Kootenay Lake Community Services Society  
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

936/19 That the Board approve $19,100 from the Enhanced Tourism Education Project Rural Dividend Funds to be paid to the South Kootenay Lake Community Services Society for ongoing tourism business training and development of promotional materials from Area A Economic Development Commission Service S107.

Carried

12. RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

937/19 That the Board receive the report entitled DRASTIC- Based Vulnerability Study - Shoreacres Aquifer as prepared by WSP Canada Inc.;

AND THAT, staff be directed to proceed with Phase 2 of the project to develop policy recommendations through a public engagement process and that these recommendations be brought to the Board for further consideration;

AND FURTHER, if funding is required it will be addressed by Area I and H Directors.

Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

938/19 That the Corporate Officer be authorized to remove the Notice on Title relating to 1020 Redbirch Road, Robson, Electoral Area J, currently owned by James Caron, property legally described as Lot 8, Block 10, District Lot 237, Kootenay District, Plan 2933, the RDCK Building Department has confirmed the building permit has been obtained and the deficiencies associated with the construction have been rectified.

Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

939/19 That the Board SUPPORTS application A1922C for the purposes of a non-farm use in the ALR proposed by Janet and Clifford Schafer for the property located at 1735 Nicks Island Road,
Electoral Area C and legally described as that part of District Lot 14878 in Reference Plan 477781 Kootenay District except those parts included in Plans 2255, 4881, and 12135 (PID 015-078-574).

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Bylaw Amendment No. 2695, 2019 being a bylaw to amend Floodplain Management Bylaw No. 2080, 2009 be read a FIRST, SECOND and THIRD time.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Bylaw Amendment No. 2695, 2019 being a bylaw to amend Floodplain Management Bylaw No. 2080, 2009 is hereby ADOPTED;

AND FURTHER, that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That Policy Number 300-09-06 Community Works Fund be amended to indicate a five (5) year reporting period instead of ten (10) years.

Carried

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That the Board direct Staff to develop policy recommendations for consideration by the Rural Affairs Committee and the Board at their March 2020 meetings, regarding possible future requests by landowners that the RDCK apply on their behalf to the Agricultural Land Commission for exclusions, once their ability to do so is removed from the Agricultural Land Commission Act as is contemplated under Bill 15 - Agricultural Land Commission Amendment Act, 2019 that was recently approved by the Legislature, but that has not yet received Royal Assent;

AND THAT, such policy recommendations be informed by existing policy documents such as Official Community Plans, the RDCK Agriculture Plan, the Agriculture Water Demand Model Report for RDCK.

Carried

13. DIRECTORS’ MOTIONS

13.1 Director Davidoff: Former Director John Voykin
Director Davidoff acknowledge former Director John Voykin, Electoral Area I, and his huge contribution to his community and the regional district.

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

That in recognition of thirty one years of service on the RDCK Board, the RDCK make donations in memory of recently deceased former RDCK Director John Voykin in the amount of $1,000 each to the Brilliant Cultural Centre, the Alzheimer Society of BC, and
Muscular Dystrophy Canada, with funds to be included in the 2020 financial plan for General Administration Service S100.

Carried

17. IN CAMERA
17.1 RESOLUTION - MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

945/19

In the opinion of the Board - and in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter - the public interest so requires that persons other than DIRECTORS, ALTERNATE DIRECTORS, DELEGATIONS AND STAFF be excluded from the meeting; AND FURTHER, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter, the meeting is to be closed on the bases identified in the following subsections:

(c) labour relations or other employee relations;
(e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
(i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;
(n) the consideration of whether a council meeting should be closed under a provision of this subsection or subsection (2);

Carried

17.2 RESOLUTION - RECESS OF OPEN MEETING
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

946/19

The Open Meeting be recessed at 2:06 p.m. in order to conduct the the In Camera Board meeting and reconvened at 2:27 p.m.

Carried

CAO Horn discussed the following topics with the Board:
- Emergency Program Act
- Budget Update
- AKBLG submissions of resolutions deadline is February 1, 2020
- 2019 RDCK Holiday Closure

18. MATTERS ARISING FROM IN CAMERA MEETING
Moved and seconded,
And Resolved:

947/19
IC94/19

That the Board accept the proposed Scope of Work submitted by SRK Consulting (Canada) Inc. for the closure design and engineering support during construction at the HB Mine Tailings Facility in the amount of $377,550 with the funds to be included in the 2020 Financial Plan for Service S187;

AND FURTHER that the Board Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Carried
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

948/19  
IC96/19  
That the Board accept the proposed Scope of Work submitted by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. for environmental support at the HB Mine Tailings Facility and legal support at the Ross Property in the amount of $220,000 with the funds to be included in the 2020 Financial Plan for Service S187;

AND FURTHER that the Board Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents.

Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

949/19  
IC98/19  
That the Board direct staff to prepare a Request for Quotation for clearing and logging the HB Mine Tailings Remediation and Closure work areas and undertake the procurement with the proponent that offers the highest value to the RDCK which meets all the required scope for less than $103,367 plus GST;

AND FURTHER that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the necessary documents to a maximum value of $103,367;

AND FURTHER that the Board approve the allocation of $103,367 for clearing and logging the HB Mine Tailings Remediation and Closure work areas from Service S187 in the 2020 Financial Plan.

Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

950/19  
IC100/19  
That the Board direct staff to proceed with the works associated with the approved Scope of Work for SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd., SRK Consulting (Canada) Inc., and a logging contractor starting on January 1, 2020, prior to the adoption of the 2020 Financial Plan.

Carried

Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

951/19  
IC103/19  
That the Board approve an increase to the Sustainability Coordinator position to 1.0 Full Time Equivalent with a 0.25 FTE to be allocated to General Administration S100 and 0.75 to Community Sustainable S105;

AND FURTHER, this be included in the 2020-2024 five year Financial Plan.

Carried

19.  
ADJOURNMENT  
Moved and seconded,  
And Resolved:

952/19  
That the meeting adjourn at 2:37 p.m.

Carried
Aimee Watson, RDCK Board Chair

Angela Lund, Secretary
Nelson’s Cannabis Lets Get it Right Forum

This forum and discussion group provides a voice for cannabis activists and cannabis consumers to contribute to the legalization and legislative process.

Highlighting a section of the Provincial Cannabis Control Regulations that prevents the licensing of cannabis businesses not associated with primary sales. Examples are cannabis cafe’s, Farm sales/tours and businesses focused on cannabis culture.

Highlighting the Provincial Tied House provisions of the Cannabis Control and License Act and it’s role in protecting consumer rights.

Survey Results

We hope that by appreciating the information presented you might carry it forward in policy discussions, when considering economic opportunities and in conversation with Provincial counterparts.

We are not asking for any specific action from the Board.
Cannabis Control Licensing Act Tied houses Inducements Div. 6 Sec. 50
A person must not arrange, or agree to arrange, with another person to sell the cannabis of a federal producer to the exclusion of the cannabis of another federal producer.
A person must not offer or give, or agree to offer or give, to a licensee or an employee of a licensee money, gifts, a reward or remuneration, directly or indirectly, to promote, induce or further the sale of a particular class or brand of cannabis.
A licensee or an employee of a licensee must not request or accept or agree to accept money, gifts, a reward or remuneration, directly or indirectly, to promote, induce or further the sale of a particular class or brand of cannabis.

History has shown that Tied house arrangements are disadvantageous to consumers, such as when a regional brewer tied nearly every pub in an area so that it became very hard to drink anything but its beer. This was a form of monopoly especially when the brewer forced poor beer onto the market from the lack of competition from better breweries. Drinks were then supplied by the brewery, quite often at an uncompetitive price relative to those paid by free houses.
What Is The Issue?

B.C. Cannabis Control
Regulation Section 37,
Marketing: A person must not
market, advertise or promote
any place as a place to consume
cannabis or to spend time after
consuming cannabis.

What Does It Mean?

No permitted place in town
to gather, socialize and
enjoy cannabis.

No farm-gate tastings or
tours.

What Can We do?
Take the Survey!
Have informed
conversations.

Still nowhere to socialize and
enjoy cannabis!

My patch of four did
great, and I want to
share!

It’s that provincial
regulation, Section 37,
that has us stuck.

Surely we could meet
somewhere better than the
muddy riverbank.

We need to get rid
of Section 37.

Then we could meet
at the cafe, or the
farmhouse!
Section 37 of The B.C. Cannabis Control Regulation states that: a person must not market, advertise or promote any place as a place to consume cannabis or to spend time after consuming cannabis. Is this an unreasonable restriction?

Yes 85%
No 13%
No Response 2%

Do you support cannabis consumption cafes?

Yes 91%
No 7%
No Response 2%
Do you believe that cannabis tourism could benefit Nelson's economy?

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%
- No Response: 3%

Do you support cannabis farm tours, and tastings?

- Yes: 94%
- No: 3%
- No Response: 3%
It has been a year since cannabis was legalized. Would you support a review of provincial regulations?

- Yes: 94%
- No: 5%
- No Response: 1%

Are you satisfied with current local cannabis bylaws?

- Yes: 13%
- No: 84%
- No Response: 3%
A goal of cannabis legalization was to eliminate the illicit market, does current policy effectively achieve this?

Do you support a Canadian's Charter Right to Peaceful Assembly?
B.C. Provincial Survey

"B.C. Should consider establishing licensed establishments (such as tasting lounges or cafes.)"

- **Agree**: 75%
- **Neither**: 8%
- **Disagree**: 16%
- **No Response**: 1%

City Of Nelson Cannabis Survey

"There should be lounges or cafes where cannabis consumption is allowed."

- **Agree**: 61%
- **Disagree**: 35%
- **No Response**: 4%
Section 37 is a full stop prohibition for any business other than retail primary such as “Farm Sales” and Cafes. This section prevents people from gathering to socialize, share and celebrate their legal cannabis.

The marketing terms “Farm Sales” “Local” and “Craft” are becoming more common. People assume it is possible. Current provincial cannabis policy does not seem to be open for review. We have a minority provincial government. The Joint Provincial Local Government Committee on Cannabis Regulation (JCCR) and other policy stakeholders have not indicated any planned meetings or discussions on the regulations. It was not raised as an issue at the UBCM.

The Cannabis Legalization and Regulation Secretariat confirms that there is no work being done to amend or repeal Section 37.

One way forward is to seek judicial review and relief from this poor policy.

The preferred way forward is for government to align policy with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and amend or repeal laws that are not reasonable limits.
The Provincial Tied House Provisions in the Cannabis Control and Licensing Act protect consumers from collusion between cannabis cultivators and retailers. This is especially important during the transition from prohibition. Limits on Tied relationships permit businesses to market freely for consumers: managing the perils of imposed limited choice and false scarcity.

There is a process for an exemption to the provision. This is the means that a “Farm Sales/Tour” business could be permitted to open.

It is important that “farm”, “local” or “craft” marketing is not based on an unfair regulatory or license process to the detriment of other legal suppliers. B.C.’s strategy to allow preference for BC wine to be sold in grocery stores is no more as of November. “B.C. shall eliminate the measures which allow only B.C. wine to be sold on regular grocery store shelves while imported (other provinces) wine may be sold in grocery stores only through a so-called ‘store within a store,’ and such contested measures shall not be replicated”.

It is up to each individual grocery store to decide whether or not to choose to sell imported wines (other provinces), calling it a “business decision.” B.C.’s Ministry of the Attorney General.
Fundamental Freedoms Section 2
Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

(c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and

(d) freedom of association

The basic theory underlying the Charter is that the state will respect choices made by individuals and, to the greatest extent possible, will avoid subordinating these choices to any one conception of the good life.

An aspect of the respect for human dignity on which the Charter is founded is the right to make fundamental personal decisions without interference from the state. This right is a critical component of the right to liberty. If the State, in pursuing a legitimate objective, uses means which are broader than is necessary to accomplish that objective then the individual's rights will have been limited for no reason. The effect of overbreadth is that in some applications the law is arbitrary or disproportionate. We suggest Section 37 BC Cannabis Control Regulation’s blanket prohibition is contrary to the Charter, poor policy, not popular and no fun at all!
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consider a land use amendment to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 for the purpose of enabling application to Health Canada for an indoor cultivation licence for cannabis.

The proposed land use amendments for property located at 3975 Highway 3A along the North Shore of Kootenay Lake are as follows:

From: Country Residential (R2)
To: Rural Residential (R3)

The initial proposal included a requested Development Variance to the maximum gross footprint and maximum gross floor area for an accessory building:

From: 250 square metres To: 569 square metres
From: 500 square metres To: 704 square metres

These Development Variances are no longer being considered and were not supported by staff.

Staff is recommending that due to the substantial changes to the proposal since the public hearing was held that the proposed amendments be referred to a second public hearing and public information session prior to further consideration.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Owner: Simon Malone

Property Location: 3975 Highway 3A, Nine Mile, North Shore of Kootenay Lake

Legal Description: Lot A District Lot 7465 Kootenay Land District Plan NEP22636 (PID 023-249-773)

Property Size: 3.3 hectares
2.1 BACKGROUND/SITE CONTEXT

The subject property is located at 3975 Highway 3A at Nine Mile on the North Shore of Kootenay Lake in Electoral Area ‘F’. The parcel is 3.3 hectares and is currently being used for residential purposes. Development on-site consists of a single family dwelling, detached garage, boat house, green house and two sheds. The property is currently zoned Country Residential (R2) under Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675 and designated Country Residential (CR) under Electoral Area ‘F’ Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2214. The proposed amendment is in alignment with the Official Community Plan and does not require a concurrent amendment.

The proposal seeks to rezone the property to utilize ‘Micro Cultivation, Cannabis’ or ‘Nursery, Cannabis’ as an accessory use in order to pursue licencing with Health Canada.

Figure 1: Site Context

Figure 2: Ortho-Imagery
The proposal was first considered by the RDCK Board at its meeting held on July 18, 2019, where the following resolutions were made:

**Resolution 556/19**
That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given FIRST and SECOND reading and referred to a PUBLIC HEARING, to be held no earlier than September 9, 2019.

**Resolution 557/19**
That in accordance with Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015, that Electoral Area 'F' Director Tom Newell is hereby delegated the authority to chair the Public Hearing on behalf of the Regional District Board.

A Public Hearing was held in October 8, 2019 at the North Shore Hall. There were 13 members of the public in attendance.

### 2.2 COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS

Concerns raised at the Public Hearing were similar to those raised during the initial referral period and included: noise, odour, increased traffic, waste, security concerns and water supply. Additional concern was raised with regard to the impacts of such facilities on surrounding property values. These concerns and how they are proposed to be addressed by the applicant are included in Attachment A (see attached).

The intent of enabling cannabis cultivation in the larger residential zones of the RDCK was to re-direct such proposals to properties of sufficient size that siting and design considerations could address potential nuisance concerns by accommodating greater setbacks from adjacent property owners. This was also done in part to reduce the impact to the limited agricultural land base within the RDCK intended for food production and industrial land base intended for larger operations. The subject property meets the minimum parcel size requirements for micro-cultivation under the proposed R3 zoning and is located in a manner where many of the community concerns raised can be adequately accommodated for. The applicant has indicated that they will scale back their original proposal in response to the community concerns raised.

Water supply remains a concern due to the low water volumes observed by community members during the summer months. The applicant will need to take steps to minimize water use at these times to ensure continued access to water by downstream users. Application has been made for a private water licence intended to not impact those on the Sitkum Creek Improvement District.

The applicant was originally pursuing a number of variances to the maximum footprint and cumulative gross floor area of an 'accessory building' to accommodate a larger indoor facility. Following a meeting with RDCK planning staff where staff conveyed their opposition to the proposed variance, the applicant has revised their proposal to comply with the size restrictions for accessory buildings within the Rural Residential (R3) zone.
SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan: □ YES ☒ NO</th>
<th>Financial Plan Amendment: □ YES ☒ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required: □ YES ☒ NO</td>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d: □ YES ☒ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $1600 application fee was received in accordance with the Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015.

b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):

This application was processed in accordance with the Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2547, 2015.

c. Environmental Considerations:

The facility is proposed to be built in a forested section of the property and will result in tree removal. Other considerations include waste production and water conservation. Waste production has been minimized by the proposed use of coconut fibre which is a re-usable product which also conserves water. There will be single use plastic produced in the packaging of the product until such a time as industry standards change.

d. Social Considerations:

Social considerations include the concerns that have been expressed by community members regarding the potential for noise, odour, increased traffic, waste, security concerns and water supply. Cannabis facilities are required to have air filter systems to mitigate odour, but such units do produce noise similar to that of air conditioning systems. Traffic related to this proposal is not anticipated to be more than that normally associated with a residential property as the proponent will be living on site. Waste disposal must meet the requirements of Health Canada in that waste product must be accounted for through disposal at a licensed facility to receive such waste and is not anticipated to have impact on site. Security is actually enhanced with licenced facilities due to surveillance requirements and the location of such facilities being monitored by RCMP. These measures were not required under the former cannabis medical licencing program. Water supply is being pursued independently of the Sitkum Creek Improvement District and should not have direct impact on properties on that system.

e. Economic Considerations:

The proposal will enable licencing under Health Canada for either indoor micro-cultivation or a nursery. The proposal will need to meet the requirements of ‘Home Based Business’ regulations and be limited in the number of employees associated with cultivation.

f. Communication Considerations:

A Public Hearing was held on October 8, 2019 as per Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015.

SECTION 4: DISCUSSION

RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 defines Micro Cultivation, Cannabis as follows:

"MICRO CULTIVATION, CANNABIS means the small scale growing of cannabis plants and harvesting material from those plants, and associated activities authorized under the Cannabis Act (Canada)."
A micro-cannabis cultivation licence from Health Canada permits 200 square metres of total canopy space and addresses requirements for security, noise, odour control, lighting and control of product. The maximum gross floor area of 250 square metres under the Rural Residential (R3) zone is intended to accommodate additional space for maneuvering of product during the various stages of the growth cycle. Space for processing and packaging of product is intended to be accommodated for on a second story. Building scale and character was intended to be such that it complemented the rural nature of larger properties which are often developed with similar sized shops, garages and accessory land use activities.

Residential zones within the RDCK require that cannabis cultivation facilities be sited similar to that of other home based businesses that can cause nuisance. Setback requirements include a 15.0 metre setback from all property lines and accessory buildings are limited to a maximum footprint of 250 square metres and a cumulative gross floor area of all accessory buildings of 500 square metres. The proposal initially included requested variances to the permitted size of an accessory building. This request has now been withdrawn and it is anticipated that the proposal will be re-designed to meet the provisions of the Rural Residential (R3) zone.

Option 1: Refer to second Public Hearing
That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be REFERRED to a second PUBLIC HEARING and public information meeting; and

That in accordance with Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015, Electoral Area F Director Tom Newell is hereby delegated the authority to chair the Public Hearing on behalf of the Regional District Board.

The proposal has been revised since the last public hearing was held and it is felt that it is necessary to provide further opportunity for the applicant and community members to build a common understanding of these changes and the potential impacts to the community in a meaningful way. Staff will facilitate a public information session prior to the Public Hearing to allow for informal information sharing before formal submissions are made.

Option 2: Proceed with Third Reading
That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading.

That ADOPTION of RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 be withheld until such a time Provincial Approval under Section 52 of the Transportation Act has been obtained.

The proposal has been revised substantially in response to the concerns raised through community consultation. It is felt that the proposal now aligns with the initial intent of the Rural Residential (R3) zone and that the applicant has demonstrated the ability to site the proposed facility in a manner that minimizes the potential to negatively impact adjacent property owners. There are provisions within the Home-Based Business regulations of RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675 which can be used as re-course if efforts are not initially successful or not maintained.

Option 3: No Further Action
That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading.
Should the Board decide to take no further action regarding the proposed amendment, the application would be closed and the applicant would not be enabled to pursue Health Canada licencing at this location. The applicant could re-apply after six months following such a decision.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
That RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 being a bylaw to amend RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be REFERRED to a second PUBLIC HEARING and public information meeting; and
That in accordance with Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015, Electoral Area F Director Tom Newell is hereby delegated the authority to chair the Public Hearing on behalf of the Regional District Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Meeri Durand,
Senior Project Planner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCURRENCE</th>
<th>Initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager of Development Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>SAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Community Concerns and Applicant Response Summary
Attachment B – Bylaw No. 2681 Public Hearing Minutes
Attachment C – RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019
Attachment A: Community Concerns and Applicant Response Summary

Neighbourhood Referral
The proposal was referred to all property owners within a 150 metre radius of the site. Responses from property owners are summarized in the table below, along with clarification by the applicant on each point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Concern and Applicant Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Concerns that the fans, and other machinery in the proposed facility will generate noise that would affect neighbouring land owners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant Response: "In general response, the noise produced from the proposed building will be insulated and sealed to reduce interior noise. The operations within the building will not create any noise that could be heard outside. There will be air conditioning units located outside of the building. We will be utilizing brand new air conditioning units that are significantly quieter than older HVAC technology and considering the distance between the units, any homes, and tree buffers, this will be enough to mitigate almost any noise coming from the site.

With respect to the five closest properties:

4005 Kane Rd. At approximately 160 meters away this is the closest property to the building and between this property and the air conditioners there will be a buffer of the proposed building itself, around 140 meters of dense forest and Sitkum Creek.

3987 Kane Rd. This property is located approximately 200 meters from the building. Again, between this property and the air conditioners, there will be a buffer of the proposed building itself, 180 meters of dense forest, and Sitkum Creek.

3965 Hwy 3A. This property is located approximately 180 meters away from the building. Between this home and the proposed building will be my house, a thick hedge, a wooden fence and approximately 100 meters of dense forest, which will be enough of a barrier to block any sound pollution from reaching their home. (The new air conditioner units will be located approximately 70 meters further away than where the current ones are located. The owners of 3965 Hwy 3A have never complained to me about the current air conditioners.)

3905 Hwy 3A. This home is approximately 200 meters away. Between this property and the air conditioners will be a large hedge, a wooden fence and approximately 170 meters of dense forest, which should be enough to block any sound pollution.

3855 Hwy 3A. This home is approximately 200 meters away. Between this home and the air conditioners is approximately 150 meters of dense forest, and a large shop/yard where the home owner runs a large heavy equipment operation that produces significantly more noise pollution than will be created by the air conditioners. This will be enough to block any sound pollution from reaching their home.
In the unlikely event that the sound is able to travel to any neighboring home and it is confirmed that noise from the site is reaching these properties, I am willing to install sound absorbing panels around the air conditioning units to mitigate any noise.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smell</th>
<th>Concern that the smell of cannabis will not be contained in the proposed facility, and will affect neighbouring land owners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Applicant Response:**

"Smell seems to be one of the main concerns, and rightfully so, both for growers and those neighbours who themselves smoke cannabis. When cultivating cannabis in a residential area, it is absolutely necessary that there is zero smell. It would not be fair whatsoever for the local community to have to deal with an obnoxious odour when there are ways growers can mitigate the smell.

I have been legally growing medical cannabis under the Access to Cannabis for Medical Purposes Regulations on this site for the past two years with no complaints of a cannabis smell or odour from any of my closest neighbours or the surrounding community. I already performed my due diligence and the new building will be a significant upgrade to control cannabis smell from the proposed building.

As previously mention I will be eliminating the potential odours from the grow areas by utilizing sealed access points and rooms for the cultivation areas. All grow areas will be air tight with no inside air escaping whatsoever. The air inside each room will be vented through carbon filters that are replaced based on a manufacturers scheduled timeline. This schedule is part of the information that I have to submit to Health Canada in order to obtain my licence to cultivate.

Each of the proposed building access points will not have any direct connection to the cultivation rooms where cannabis is present and will be cleaned with the 24/7 operation of a carbon filter, changed out on a regular schedule prior to exceeding their recommended lifespan. There will be some exhaust fans located in the building to meet fire code requirements, these exhaust ports will be outfitted with both a carbon filter as well as an ozone generating filter. This is above and beyond any Health Canada requirements, and I will incur these costs to mitigate any smell from the site. Before Health Canada will issue us a licence we will need to have the building fully built to code, and compliant with the Cannabis Act and regulations. This includes satisfactory odour control which they examine as part of the application. We will also have to provide a binder with all of our Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), which includes all of our maintenance schedules including odour control. If Health Canada were to do an audit and find that we had not replaced our odour control infrastructure according to our SOP’s, we can be ordered to ensure we are maintaining our odour control, fined or lose or licence if it becomes a permanent problem.

If there are issues, we will set up a complaint system for the date and time when a odour complaint made. That way we can investigate the source of the odour (if it is
coming from our site) and determine the cause so that it can be mitigated in the future. This will be detailed in our SOP’s.

I believe the changes to the new Cannabis Act are a move in the right direction when it comes to the cultivation of cannabis, the safety of the products, and the removal of the obnoxious odours in our communities. Everyone has at some point driven down the highway with their window down and smelt that skunk cannabis smell and were glad it wasn’t in front of their house. Allowing the cannabis community in Nelson gravitate toward the new legal landscape will be better for everyone, with proper regulation we will slowly eliminate the smells, the use of pesticides, the dumping of dirt on FSR’s and they many other things that give cannabis cultivators a bad reputation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Potential for increase in traffic to the proposed facility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Response:</td>
<td>&quot;Traffic will be very minimal after construction is complete. The company will employ four full time staff my wife, my brother, myself and another hired hand. My wife and I live on site and my brother and our employee will drive in. There will be no on-site sales at all, each harvest will be sold in bulk to a supply chain company which would pick up once every three weeks. Materials will be brought to site from town in a pickup truck and trailer once every three weeks. The driveway only passes by one residence and there is dense forest between the driveway and the home. Based on this information there will be minimal traffic impacts.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Concern about level of security, and if it will interfere with the ability for the Sitkum Creek Improvement District to access and maintain the water works.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Response:</td>
<td>&quot;Security is extremely important consideration for our operations. My wife, young children and myself all live on site so I am developing protocols that will not only ensure cannabis is safe and secure but that my family is also safe. The last thing we want is to have a security breach. We will have a locked gate at the bottom of our driveway and Health Canada requires the building to have a secure perimeter, this will be in the form of a tall fence with a locked gate that can only be accessed through a key card that only staff will possess. The building will be constructed of steel and will have steel doors to increase security. Health Canada also requires that access throughout the building is a tiered key card system where only qualified personnel can access the rooms with cannabis, and security areas, ensuring that neither employees nor anyone without authorized access has an opportunity to steal anything from site. The critical areas of the facility will have 365/24/7 security camera system, as well as an intrusion detection system that will detect unauthorized access, intrusion, or tampering with the system. Health Canada takes security very seriously, and I will not receive a licence to produce until I can prove I have all of these measures in place. We plan on only letting close friends and family, and the surrounding community know what is being cultivated on our property. There will be no on-site sales and no advertising. I believe that someone wanting to steal cannabis would not choose to&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
take the risk and attempt to steal it from such a secure building with multiple tiers of protection.

There will also be minimal storage of finished dried Cannabis. When it is dry and ready for market it will be immediately removed from the property.

One of the neighbours I spoke to expressed concern that potential criminals would use her yard to access the shop, but as she and I discussed, the reality is they would either break in through my gate, or possibly come from the forest service road behind my property. It would be an extremely unlikely occurrence to have someone steal cannabis on foot and use her property as an access point.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Concerns over waste disposal location and safety of waste.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Response:</td>
<td>“The waste that will be produced by this cultivation facility will be dealt with as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Plastic packaging from plant medium and plant food etc. will be recycled at the local recycle depot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) All excess cannabis plant matter will be disposed of following Health Canada and provincial regulations. Hopefully soon regulations will change and the extra plant matter can be utilized by other companies to make hemp products. At this time that is not an option, so excess plant matter will be mulched and mixed 50/50 with leaf, yard waste, wood chips, animal manure, coco or cat litter to make in unrecognizable and to remove the traces of its active ingredient, cannabinoid. Once completed it will be brought to the appropriate waste disposal location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will be using coco coir as our growing medium of choice, for us it is the most environmentally friendly medium. Peat is quite controversial, depleting the Canadian peat bogs, and releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere in the process. Rockwool is harmful for those handling it and does not decompose quickly and will sit in the landfill for a very long time. Coco coir is the fibrous material found on the inside of coconut shells, and until recently it was considered a waste material. Today it is widely used as a replacement for peat. Coco coir is a highly sustainable substance because it is a natural by product of coconut production and can easily be replaced. It also doesn’t break down and decompose at the same rate of peat, so it can be re-used multiple times greatly reducing waste. When it comes to disposing of the pure coco coir, no pesticides will have been used, and the coco will be safe to be disposed of at the local waste disposal facility or stored on the property for secondary uses. Coco is a non toxic material and would be considered a domestic waste. Hopefully at some point there will be a recycling program in place in Nelson where it can be used by others.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply</th>
<th>Concerns regarding the Sitkum Creek Improvement District and the capacity to provide for this proposal and existing users.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Note:</strong></td>
<td>The applicant has been notified that the Sitkum Creek Improvement District would prefer that treated water not be used for irrigation and has been directed to make independent application for a water licence on Sitkum Creek. The applicant will be required to pursue an independent water source to support their operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Public Hearing for Bylaw No. 2681, a proposed amendment Bylaw No. 2681, was held on October 8, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at the North Shore Hall, 675 Whitmore Road, Nelson, BC. The Hearing commenced at 6:05 p.m. There were 13 members of the public in attendance, the applicant was not present.

PRESENT

Tom Newell, Chair of Public Hearing
Darcy Roszell, Planner
Shelly Kindred-Fawcett, Public Hearing Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Director Tom Newell called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

Director Newell introduced himself and the RDCK staff to the public.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL

Darcy Roszell, Planner gave an overview of the proposal.

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT

The applicant did not make a presentation.

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

The public asked questions which were answered by the Chair and Planner.

Questions and concerns are summarized as follows:

Q: Are you concerned that there has been a power outage for the past hour and a quarter possibly preventing some people from coming? (This question was asked following the Director's introduction)

A: Very much so. We've contemplated this but the meeting was delayed over the Summer out of concerns that people wouldn't be able to attend. I made a motion at the Board table to delay it until the Fall. And now coincidentally after 3 or 4 months delay these circumstances have come forward. I suppose if tomorrow we were to receive a lot of reports from people who were unable to attend, we could go to the Board requesting a second public hearing, and this has been done where a second public
hearing has been held at the recommendation from the Board. So, we'll use this information as best we can. We felt we could hold the public hearing but we were concerned about that.

*the power returned at this moment*

Q: Is Horticulture the same as micro-cultivation?

A: It is not. Horticulture would be growing roses in a greenhouse or some sort of farm it would not include Cannabis. Cannabis and the production of cannabis is specifically defined in our bylaws. As of last year one of our Senior Project planners went through all of our bylaws in the Regional District and made those changes in order to align with the new Federal Law legalizing cannabis.

Q: The main concerns that we are addressing, I know as far as community input went...property values or effect of property values was a huge concern to at least half a dozen of us. How come that was not on there? Are we allowed questions to speak to that?

A: Property values, I wouldn’t say they were intentionally left off of this list. This was meant to be a compilation that I found to be the most common concerns, having something left off this list doesn’t mean that it wasn’t a concern. All of your letters and all of your statements will be seen by the Board. This list here is not the definitive list.

Q: Has the RDCK looked into or done any investigation as to what an operation this size will effect neighboring property values?

A: Not to my knowledge, I know of no definitive study that has been brought to our attention that I can think of in any our cannabis discussions or the process to incorporating it into our bylaws where that was specifically researched and said if it was a fact or not a fact. Not speaking directly to this proposal, property value is a difficult thing to quantify when looking at a zoning change adjacent property. It's not something we can say, “Here's a cannabis production facility that means the adjacent property will see this difference in their Property Values”. As far as I know, there is no direct science to that affect.

Q: All the zoning that's yellow shows (R3), can they have a grow op too?

A: Under current zoning those properties that are shaded yellow are R3 and yes they could have cannabis production facility.

Q: What’s the track record within the regional district and not limited to Area F, with the micro cannabis operations, I know this is a blossoming industry. What do you know about the ones that are in existence in the regional district or are there none?

A: To my knowledge there have been less micro cannabis cultivation facilities given licenses by Health Canada than I can count on my fingers. Very few have been granted by Health Canada. As to their track record in the RD that is not something I can comment on. The regulation compared to medical licenses in the past, if you have a question about that I could speak to.

Q: So, their original application said they wanted just a micro cannabis so if they don't get that license that means they can do all the other cannabis things that are in a R3, is that correct?

A: No, that is not correct. I will speak in a hypothetical situation if this application went forward to the Board and the Board were to approve, and they decided not to have a micro cultivation license or not to pursue micro cultivation license they would need a license from Health Canada to do anything Cannabis related.

Q: But the zoning would allow them to make that application? The Regional District won't control what cannabis thing they can apply to do?

A: To clarify, if they don’t get permission to micro cultivate – you are thinking maybe they’d be able to micro processing because the zoning will allow it or nursery.

If he was denied a micro cultivation license or he decided he did not want to pursue a micro cannabis licence he would still have to go to Health Canada for a license for micro processing or nursery.

Q: If the R3 granted, he has the right? There are no more hearings no more application within the Regional District for input from us. It is done?
A: Yes, but I should say that if you are in favour of only micro cultivation and you say, but I do not want micro-processing or nursery or portable sawmills then you should definitely make that known. If myself and Director Newell were to hear it, no more portable sawmills, or no more keeping of farm animals and no nursery cannabis then we would remove those uses and those uses would not be permitted in that zone.

Q: Just to clarify, if we objected – you’re saying we have to go to the Board please change the zoning to not allow these things. Am I following you?

A: We can pass a motion at the Board saying we are changing this to Rural Residential (R3) and we’re only going to allow this. Everything else is not allowed.

Q: So, as it stands assuming they can get approval from Health Canada they could do the other two things?

A: We’ve passed cases where we’ve done rezoning, but the rezoning has been limited to not the full scope of what the zoning allows. It might be limited to the one thing they want to do and none of the other things can subsequently be brought in to that zoning. We limit the zoning to the specific.

Q: The original application that they filed in May was for micro cultivation cannabis. The bylaw we are having the public meeting for tonight it totally broad. We are here because we responded to the number one issue. The actual bylaw inherently allows the other two cannabis things. You’re saying it could be restricted. If we gave the submission to you – saying if you’re going to do it, restrict it. We didn’t know that.

A: You’re correct, the initial referral was for a site specific we call it a text amendment to the R2 Zone. If you turn to page 3 of your hand out, it says at the top of the page it says at the top rural residential (R3) to the left of that you see country residential (R2). The initial proposal from the applicant was to essentially add in the use of micro cultivation in the R2 zone.

You’re correct that the proposal was modified to the current proposal of changing it to R3. That was done at the staff level because we felt that in talks with the applicant we suggested that the R3 zone was more suited to what the applicant was looking for in terms of similarly to adjacent sites, site size and the uses he was looking for.

Q: Sounds like he is looking for broader range of use than just micro cultivation. If he wasn’t he wouldn’t need anything more than R2.

A: It is my understanding that he isn’t looking for any broader uses and that’s a great comment, that if those uses are not planned to be used that they could be removed from the proposal.

Tom Newell: Just to recap where we are at. Started with an amendment to R2 in consultation with staff what ultimately evolved that the staff recommendation to the applicant to apply for R3 which would then encompass what one intention was but it would then not have this one R2 with this exception to it. It would be more cohesive to the other properties that are R3 it was deemea at the time for whatever reason deemed a more expedient way of dealing with this request for micro cultivation to just simply make it R3 like the surrounding properties.

Q: I am the most affected driveway is right beside my house and at the bottom that’s my property he has to go through. At the first it was a pick-up truck and not it’s a logging truck.

A: The MOI at during the referral stage they required a commercial access permit.

Q: The R3 zoning surrounding this property. I personally was not aware of the R3 being adjacent to it. First of all, when were all those put in as R3, secondly are there any operations currently operating under the R3 zoning and thirdly when was the cannabis added to the R3 proposal and does R3 currently allow it and if yes, when did that happen without public input?

A: We began at a regional level to incorporate the new federal law and the provincial interpretation of those laws, we were mandated to deal with cannabis and we were told we had to deal land use There
were many public hearings regarding at the Regional District, the Prestige, Radio and newspaper ads. The public consultation was quite extensive.

Q: Excuse me, and the response was this was a great thing?
A: The Regional District had no choice. We had to incorporate the legalization of this usage into our land use, in the areas to which there is zoning within the regional district. We were required to incorporate the legalization of this. That was the intense 2-3 year process that Meeri spearheaded along with staff.

Q: When was the R3 Zoning put in there and when was the cannabis added into the R3 zoning with cannabis being so contentious why would they decide that should be a part of the R3 rather than separate zoning all together when your surrounding neighborhoods, which are bedroom community to Nelson to put that in that type of zoning in that area. I'm just dumbfounded.
A: One of our Senior Project Planners, Meeri Durand spearheaded public consultation and incorporating cannabis production into our zoning bylaws. Essentially, our zoning bylaws for residential zones we have R1, R2, R3...quite a number of zones. R1 has quite a small minimum lot size, as you go up the numbers the minimum lot size increases. I believe that R3 is the serving minimum lot size that allowed cannabis production, and the minimum lot size in the R3 Zone is 2 hectares and this lot is 3.3 hectares.

Q: Why wouldn't they consider industrial zoning, rather than residential? How could they possibly think that residential is going to be compatible with cannabis...it is industrial/commercial.
A: I think you have a great question, I will give you Meeri Durand's contact information. She is the best to go into a full explanation and I doubt a delay in the response to your question will hinder your comments.

As to when the zoning for each parcel was formally allocated I remember sitting here in 1993 and we voted to incorporate zoning into the area. It was contentious, there was a huge backlash to having any zoning. The director at the time was quite committed and it went to referendum and agreed to have zoning, I think at that time spearheaded the process of the beginning to allocated zoning to the various lots that existed. That is the evolution of the R3 out there.

Zoning bylaws they are ever evolving, they are not static documents.

Q: So anybody who owns any of those properties in yellow (R3) could sell that chunk of land and do any of these marijuana stuff, right?
A: Subject to approval from Health Canada. Health Canada has a set of rules and regulations that are quite broad and quite strict. However, like I mentioned earlier, there have been hardly any of these approved by Health Canada.

Q: Is there any consultation process that takes place prior to Health Canada issuing a license?
A: Micro-cannabis allows a 200 square meter canopy, industrial size license a much larger production output.

Q: So, if he (Malone) gets approval he still has to get the permit from Health Canada?
A: That's correct.

Q: If this was to get approved do you guys have a Bylaw officer for smell?
A: The enforcement of the regulations that are the commitment that is the noise and smell, it's tricky. Health Canada states you have to filter and now we've given you a license falls on the bylaw officers of the municipalities or area or regional district to now enforce their regulations, it is my understanding that it is tricky.

I believe Health Canada does enforce certain things security and odor.

Q: What about the traffic going up there?
A: I am speaking from the Applicant’s submission, this is not my statement or my guarantee; this is what the applicant has stated. In the Applicant’s submission, it was stated that there would be four employees: two of them would be the applicant and his wife.

Q: What about the road?

A: That is something that the applicant has to work out with you and the Ministry of Transportation.

FORMAL SUBMISSIONS FOR OR AGAINST PROPOSED BYLAW NO. 2681

Written Formal Submissions received prior to the Public Hearing are attached and form part of these minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Received Date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex &amp; Rosemary Wallach</td>
<td>September 14, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3882 Highway 3A</td>
<td>See attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Wallach</td>
<td>October 7, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3864 Highway 3A</td>
<td>See attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERBAL and WRITTEN formal submissions received during the Public Hearing:

Alex and Rosemary Wallach – (written submission) 3882 Highway 3A – Nelson, BC

We, Alex and Rosemary Wallach own the lot adjacent to Malone’s and have no problem with the rezoning application, we are out of the country until September 20 so cannot attend a public meeting if held before the 20th.

Susan Wallach – (written submission) 3864 Highway 3A

I write this letter further to my previous one dated June 25, 2019 and in response to Bylaw No. 2681, 2019. I have had the opportunity to read the Committee Report dated July 5, 2019 and submitted to the Rural Affairs Committee. My comments arise from that report and the resulting proposed bylaw.

Notice
The letter of notice from RDCK dated May 23, 2019 dealt with the Malone application Z1904F for rezoning only to allow micro cannabis cultivation and an increase in floor area size. That is the limited application to which we provided our previous written responses.

We are now facing a broader bylaw amendment with rezoning entirely to R3 which includes micro processing, cannabis and nursery cannabis which were not sought nor addressed in the original published application. We should have been given formal notice of the changed application and adequate time to respond. Notice of Public Hearing is not adequate.

The nearest R3 is not adjacent to the property that is subject to the application as suggested in the committee report (pg. 76). There is land zoned R3 across Sitkum Creek but up the mountain and separated by a R2 zone between the creek and the existing R3 (see the map attached to the proposed bylaw Schedule A). This is hardly reason to support rezoning to R3

Sitkum Creek Improvement District (SCID)
I am a water user in this system and have the following concerns;
In the Committee Report to the RDCK the board the chair of SCID is quoted as saying at page 67 that "... the SCID trustees do not object to the Malone rezoning application ... ". The Trustees took it upon themselves to speak for the water users on an issue where they were without jurisdiction and with no consultation with users. Their comment should be struck from the record as being without statutory authority and without consent of the users.

SCID has a registered Statutory Right of Way #U13109 over the Malone property. It runs parallel to their house from Sitkum Creek and the intake and filtration facility. Security and sound mitigation measures as proposed in the committee report have the potential to interfere with it and the necessary access to maintain the waterline, intake and filtration system.

On 3905 Highway 3A the SCID has its UV facility. Part of its statutory right of way (SRW) runs from the Malone property to the UV house. In the Committee report at page 68 the large hedge and wooden fence proposed by Malone as noise abatement measures will interfere with the SRW

The proposal for rezoning does not address the issues of this interference and how it would be mitigated.

Size of buildings
The applicants seek a significant increase in the permitted maximum accessory building footprint to 569 square meters, more than double what is currently permitted in R3. They provide no reason to justify the increase as necessary for their operation. Their application does not present this as a Health Canada requirement for application approval.

If the rezoning for this property is granted and they are given the greater footprint for their accessory buildings this will grant them an unfair business advantage over other R3 cannabis operators, their competitors, who are bound by the existing provisions for gross floor area and cumulative gross floor area as set out in the current R3.

Cannabis licence
If zoning is approved and the Malone’s get their cultivation licence is the RDCK ready for this?
Are there:
- Mechanism for complaints?
- Data collection for complaints if there is a smell/noise pollution and/or light pollution?
- Air quality regulations?
- Light pollution regulations?
- Noise pollution regulations?
- What responsibility will the RDCK assume or is it all up to the Health Canada regulations and enforcement?
- Does the RDCK have regulations that are in addition to Health Canada Requirements?
- What are RDCK over sight and enforcement powers?
- Are there enforceable standards and enforceable regulations we can rely on?

If there is little or none of the above in place then any zoning change for cannabis cultivation in any form be it micro, processing, cultivation or nursery should be put on hold. Without RDCK safe guards we will be left to our own remedies to protect our residential neighbourhoods.
In addition it is a significant change to put a commercial operation and particularly one of these types in the middle of a long established residential area.

Sitkum Creek
The application does not address how it will protect Sitkum Creek from any accidental harm from their proposed operation such as commercial waste going into the water. The property is immediately beside Sitkum creek and is on a slope. It has now been clear cut in preparation for building and site development. There may be a risk of silt or runoff entering the creek.

There are domestic water licences on the creek. It is also an active Kokanee spawning habitat. Stock piles of excess cannabis plant matter that are composed may accidentally enter the creek. Other material may enter the creek from the operation.

In conclusion I ask that no further action be taken with respect to this zoning amendment in Bylaw No. 2681, 2019 and preferably that the Malone application be denied.

Sylvia Stevens – (business address) 593 Baker Street, Coldwell Banker Rosling Real Estate – Nelson, BC

I actually brought this up at a meeting in our office staff and it was quite volatile. My concerns are as a Realtor if I’m in that area showing residential my experience with the public is they definitely want to know about the neighbourhoods that they’re introducing. I have great concerns about this causing stigmatism to that area, no different than if you live next to a refuse site. AND if you didn’t tell that Seller or that Buyer that ‘Hey, there’s a (inaudible) site down a kilometre down the road’ and they find out I didn’t report that to them they can turn around and sue me. So, as a Realtor if I am starting to sell properties in that area I definitely would be telling people, ‘by the way just so you know there RZ zoning over there and there is a cannabis operation’.

I believe there is a fairly large portion of the population that would not buy that property. And I believe the experience from my years as a Real Estate Agent since 1995 that you would definitely drop the property values in that area. This is a residential area, a bedroom community in Nelson in my opinion with cannabis operations, commercial operations they shouldn’t be in any residential zoning. That comment I would like to make for the ROCK to take into consideration why would you introduce something that is going to be so contentious in a neighbourhood that is a bedroom community. There are so many concerns about the long term effects of that, in my personal opinions it would definitely affect your property values. We would have to disclose that to anybody (inaudible).

Nicolas Sorokin – 3918 MacGregor Road

I would like to say that this is going to set precedent to the rest of the West Arm and all its residents to what is going to be happening to the future (unknown) it scares us. Property values are one thing to consider but also our community in general is not going to prosper. This doesn’t bring any value to our homes, to our people, to our families. It’s really not a thing that we want. Although we are the (inaudible) majority I think. It’s time I think the rest of the people in the West Arm need to know what’s going on, this has been kept hush and that’s what we feel, I don’t think you know half of it. This person moves on in his life sells his property to somebody else. They might not be as kind and as neighbourly as all that as Simon is. And that is a fear that we have. Thank you.

Jocelyn Jacobs – 3800 and 3855 HWY 3A
My concerns are smell is one not the top one but equivalent to property value to be honest. Health Canada requirements in my view do not seem to be strict enough to eradicate smell. There's various numerous operations may not be micro cannabis but there's the one Aurora Sky in Edmonton, to my knowledge in Alberta and BC. There is BC Tweed which has two of them.

There is Gatineau, Quebec. Langley, Delta, Ontario, these are just ones I found in newspaper articles where they are all Health Canada approved. They all have smell problems.

In my mind Health Canada standards are not strict enough to protect us especially residential neighborhoods. Therefore, what you're asking us to do is to trust that the Malone's to go the extra mile.

Aurora Sky has put in (this is all in my formal letter from before) numerous different HVAC filters, charcoal filters, and different smells to help eradicate this. There's still a problem at the Edmonton Airport. There's another one in I believe it *inaudible* This is also in my previous letter that has spent well around the Million dollar mark, has not been successful yet.

Because all of us are downwind from this proposed operation we're going to suffer for that. There's no way that if there is a smell that we're not going to smell it and be affected by it. And not have our windows open, it's just going to permeate everything. Smell is a huge one.

In the Vancouver Sun, the province (this is in a Vancouver Sun article where it states, the province has dictated that cannabis can be considered an agricultural crop and legislation protects farmers from liability when it comes to nuisance, odours, noises, dust and other disturbances from normal farming practices. Regional Districts, local municipalities are caught in the middle trying to deal with issues that affect the resident's quality of life even though they have limited powers.

That leads me to if this goes forward is there a bylaw in place or will there be a bylaw in place the RDCK were to protect us residents from this. We shouldn't be the ones suffering.

As far as property values go, which is my (inaudible) issue this is not at all in the RDCK community report that I sought and it is not refuted by the Malone's to date. So, back in June prior to the first round of letters that when in, I spoke with BC Assessment Authority in Cranbrook they said they're being prompted to report how cannabis operations affect property values but to date there is simply not enough data to definitively say one way or the other. These are the experts in the field aside from our realtors.

I've also talked to the BC Assessment Appeal Board to see if there was anything on file or anything pending. There aren't any decisions on file that are similar to the Malone's application but because this is in its infancy. There's currently one appeal pending that is the most similar however, the decision on that is not expected until late October or into November.

What we are asking is that we simply aren't the guinea pigs to set precedence for property values and how such as this will affect property values. We have all worked hard to purchase our properties to maintain them. They are sacred, they are our sanctuaries.

One of the bylaws at the RDCK is for the quiet, peaceful and enjoyment of residents on their property is that not correct? I believe that is in the bylaw of the RDCK. Because of this change, the fact that our
lifestyle on our property and not to mention financially possibly could be affected, is simply not fair, it's not right, is unjust. This is something that should not be "inaudible". It is something that should definitely be in a commercial or industrial area.

At the very minimum, what I would request well, what I would like is for this to be turned down, but at the minimum I would ask for a moratorium on this decision until there is at least well, a lot more data to make an informed decision on how this is indeed going to affect the residents in the area.

A nursery micro cannabis grow op because "inaudible" having pot plants outside is only going, which to bring up Mr. Malone has two permits currently in place if I'm not mistaken where he does grow some plants up there. In his comments in the community report he's stated that he's had no complaints from neighbors whatsoever. He's under the assumption that there is no smell based on that neighbors can smell. We can smell them, we can smell not at our residence but when we can smell them when we are up at our property that is above our house. We have not complained simply because we are not outside lounging around, it's not our main "inaudible" at this point. But there is indeed smell in that area.

So, I really feel that it's not appropriate for the mass majority of our residents to be put a risk of having our liveability degraded because of someone else's desire to grow cannabis in public.

I also feel like the government should be looking at this from the front end because I feel it's really easy for senior levels of government to put something like this in place. By the time it riles down to the local levels of government such as the RDCK it's hard for you guys to fix the issues that residents have "inaudible". So, in closing I object

I have more, sorry. Property values: There was an incident I think back in 2015. Shawinigan Lake, which is on the island where they had a grow-up in their neighbourhood. Eight neighbors. There's an article also attachment to the first letter I sent in. Eight residents went in and appealed their property assessments, all eight of those properties were devalued 20%. There are some statistics, I know that things have changed somewhat in the last few years but there are no statistics at this point to say that they don't affect and that's because BC Assessment has not any data on it at this time.

ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING

The hearing was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Director Tom Newell,
Area F

Darcy Roszell
Planner
Attachment B – RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Bylaw No. 2681, 2019

A Bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004, and amendments thereto.

NOW THEREFORE the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay, in open meeting assembled, HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

APPLICATION

1. That Schedule ‘Schedule A’ of Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be amended the zoning designation of Lot A District Lot 7465 Kootenay Land District Plan NEP22636 (PID 023-249-773) from Country Residential (R2) to Rural Residential (R3) as shown on the attached map.

2. This Bylaw shall come into force and effect upon its adoption.

CITATION

3. This Bylaw may be cited as “RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2681, 2019.”

READ A FIRST TIME this 18th day of July, 2019.

READ A SECOND TIME this 18th day of July, 2019.

WHEREAS A PUBLIC HEARING was held this 8th day of October, 2019.

READ A THIRD TIME this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

APPROVED under Section 52 (3)(a) of the Transportation Act this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

Approval Authority,
Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

ADOPTED this [Date] day of [Month], 2019.

__________________________ ______________________________
Aimee Watson, Board Chair Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 2:50 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Agenda for the December 3, 2019 Area A Economic Development Commission meeting, be adopted with the inclusion of a draft 2020 budget as item 7.5 under New Business.

RECEIPT OF MINUTES
The November 5, 2019 Area A Economic Development Commission minutes, have been received.

DELEGATE
Laverne Booth was not able to attend or call in to speak to the funding proposals submitted to the Commission from the East Shore Transportation Society, Building East Shore Tourism and EastShore.Life.

REPORTS
5.1 Building East Shore Tourism
The Commission Report received by email on November 2, 2019 from Geoffrey Tremblay, B.E.S.T. East Shore Life Final Reporting has been received.

A verbal report from Commissioner Jackson indicates that the ending of the provincial Rural Dividend funding program means the project will likely have to be completed without the requested funding deadline extension into 2020.
5.2 **EastShore.Life (ESL)**

The Commission reports received by email on November 2, 2019 from Geoffrey Tremblay, Google Ads Final report and ESL Maintenance Budget report, have been received.

6. **OLD BUSINESS**

6.1 **Area A Economic Development Commission 2019 Workplan – Lake Access**

MOVED and seconded,

AND Resolved:

The Area A Economic Development Commission workplan item regarding Lake Access will be referred to the Creston Kootenay Lake Economic Action Plan; AND FURTHER the Commission recommend that the item become a priority based on its high rank in the public consultation phase.

Carried

6.2 **Proposed revisions to Bylaw 2677 for Area A Economic Development Commission**

MOVED and seconded,

AND Resolved:

That the Area A Economic Development Commission is in agreement with most changes proposed by Corporate Administration with the exception that in the clause 5(2) the paragraph should conclude with the word “membership” and delete the phrase “including but not limited to....”.

Carried

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

7.1 **Resignation of Commissioner Durnin**

The notice of Commissioner Durnin’s resignation from the Commission effective the end of 2019 with appreciation of the opportunity to serve, was received.

7.2 **Building East Shore Tourism Marketing Continuation Application**

The BEST Marketing Continuation Application was referred to the January meeting.

7.3 **Community Bus Funding Application**

The Community Bus Funding Application was referred to the January meeting with request that the proponent provide in the proposal a more detailed outline that can also be used as a guideline for the writer of the business plan, with the following items included:

- include the rationale for service need (based on an analysis of original and any follow-up survey results with analysis);
- definition of level of commitment from other significant potential customer groups or partners such as the Yasodhara Ashram;
- fixed and variable costs of operation and options for cost recovery; and
- how the service may connect to others in the region. The budget of how funds would be used, and time estimated for completion.

7.4 **EastShore.Life Continuation Application**

The EastShore.Life Continuation Application was referred to the January meeting.
7.5 Draft 2020 Budget

The Draft 2020 Budget was referred to the January meeting with proposed changes as follows:

- to consider being an increase to the Administrative Support item to $2,000.00
- to include a specific budget amount for annual basic function of EastShore.Life website and document storage for the benefit of the Area A Economic Development Commission, separate from other website purposes; and
- to increase the mileage budget to a suggested level of $800.00.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next Area A Economic Development Commission meeting date will be determined.

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED and seconded,

AND Resolved:

The Area A Economic Development Commission meeting be adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Carried

Chairperson Signature

Secretary Signature
Date: December 9, 2019
Time: 7:08 p.m.
Location: West Creston Community Hall
Address: 1350 West Creston Rd Creston, BC V0B-1G7

MEMBERS PRESENT
Allen McLaren - Chair
Lori Kepke - Vice-Chair
Carmen Lydom - Secretary
Roger Chadwick

MEMBERS ABSENT
Ted Yarema
Steve Fischer
Cal Germann

RDCK STAFF PRESENT - None

GUESTS PRESENT – Don Tilling

1. CALL TO ORDER:
   By: Al McLaren
   Time: 7:08

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA:
   Moved by: Al McLaren
   Seconded by: Lori Kepke
   With Amendments that: None

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:
   Moved by: Al McLaren
   Seconded by: Roger Chadwick
   That the Minutes of the November 6, 2019, meeting be adopted as circulated with the following
   amendments: None

4. AGENDA ITEM:
   Consideration of ALR application – RDCK Planning File V1908C
   Don Tilling of TB Contractors sat in for Garth and Karen Tippe. Don explained the building, plans and
timeline of construction for the accessory building being constructed (starting spring of 2020) prior to
the primary residence going up (spring of 2021)
Al McLaren moved that the Area C APC approve the variance application. Seconded by: Roger Chadwick
All in Favour: 4 Against: 0

New to discuss by members: Discussion was held about requesting RDCK to provide applicant’s contact information with their referral forms.

5. **ADJOURNMENT:**
   Moved By: Lori Kepke Seconded by: Roger Chadwick Time: 7:37 p.m.

Minutes prepared by C.Lydom and reviewed by A.McLaren, who confirms their accuracy
Cc: Garth and Karen Tippe – gtippe@telus.net
5:00 pm
Tuesday, January 7, 2020
Castlegar & District Community Complex

COMMISSION MEMBERS
Commissioner B. Price (Chair) City of Castlegar
Commissioner A. Davidoff Electoral Area I
Commissioner R. Smith Electoral Area J
Commissioner D. Rye City of Castlegar
Commissioner B. Tassone City of Castlegar

MEMBERS ABSENT
Sabrina Carmichael Administrative Coordinator – Community Services
Cary Gaynor Regional Parks Manager

STAFF
Joe Chirico General Manager – Community Services
Jim Crockett Manager of Recreation (CDRD)
Audrey Maxwell Polovnikoff Recreation Coordinator (CDRD)

CHAIR APPOINTED

There being no further nominations, Jim Crockett, Manager of Recreation ratifies the appointment of Commissioner Price as Chair of the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission for 2020.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair Price called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
   MOVED and seconded,
   AND Resolved:

   01/20 The Agenda for the January 7, 2020 Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission meeting, be adopted as circulated.
3. RECEIPT OF MINUTES
   The December 3, 2019 Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission minutes, have been received.

4. DELEGATE
   4.1 Dustin LePage, from Robson Fire Rescue Society will present to the Commission to obtain approval to store a C-can container at the Pass Creek Exhibition Grounds.

   International Fire Fighters games Entity no longer exists. Robson Fire Rescue Society puts on the Firefighter Games.

   Dustin provided a verbal presentation on the Fire Fighter Games how they are good for the community and specifically because they aid the firefighter retention/recruitment.

   The Robson Fire Rescue Society would like to store a C-can container (40’) at the Pass Creek Exhibition Grounds for the purpose of storing props/equipment for the annual Firefighter Games.

   Dustin answered the Commission’s questions.

   Delegation left the meeting at 5:26 pm

5. STAFF REPORTS
   5.1 Staff Report
   The Commission Report dated December 20, 2019 from Audrey Maxwell Polovnikoff, Recreation Coordinator, re: Staff Report, has been received.

   5.2 Castlegar Hockey Society – Advertising Waiver Request
   The Commission Report dated December 30, 2019 from Jim Crockett, Manager of Recreation, re: Castlegar Hockey Society, has been received.

   Moved and seconded,
   AND Resolved:

   02/20 That the Commission take no further action on the Castlegar Hockey Society – Advertising Waiver Request.

   Carried

   Area I Director, Andy Davidoff and Area J Director, Rick Smith will provide a one time grant in aid of two thousand ($2,000) each, to provide funds to the Castlegar Rebels for the 2019/20 season through the Community Development Grant.
5.3 International Firefighter Games Storage (Item Referred from Dec. 3, 2019 meeting)
The below motion was referred from the December 3, 2019 meeting of the Commission. Recreation Commission report from Cary Gaynor, Regional Parks Manager attached for reference.

106/19 That the following motion BE REFERRED to the January 2020 meeting of the Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission meeting:

That the Regional District of Central Kootenay enter into an agreement with International Firefighter Games Inc. to have a fixed storage container building on Pass Creek Regional Park property;

AND FURTHER, That staff be directed to review and investigate other options with regards to in-kind donations/grant funding to address this storage need and legal ownership of any proposed assets.

Moved and seconded, AND Resolved:

03/20 That the Commission take no further action on the International Firefighter Games Storage request. Carried.

Moved and seconded, AND Resolved:

04/20 That staff provide the Commission with a report on adding a C-Can at the Pass Creek Park, working through the Pass Creek Exhibition Society, for the next Commission meeting. Carried.

Staff to provide the background on the relationship with the International Firefighting Games and RDCK Fire Services.

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.1 2020 Draft Financial Plan

Moved and seconded, AND Resolved:

05/20 That the Draft Financial plan BE REFERRED to the January 28th Commission meeting, subject to date confirmation. Carried.

7. PUBLIC TIME

No questions from the public.
8. IN CAMERA

8.1 MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC
06/20 Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved:

In the opinion of the Board - and, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter – the public interest so requires that persons other than DIRECTORS, ALTERNTAE DIRECTORS, DELEGATIONS AND STAFF be excluded from the meeting;

AND FURTHER, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter, the meeting is to be closed on the basis(es) identified in the following Subsections:

90. (1) A part of a council meeting may be closed to the public if the subject matter being considered relates to or is one or more of the following:
(e) the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
(n) the consideration of whether a council meeting should be closed under a provision of this subsection or subsection (2);

Carried.

8.2 RECESS OF OPEN MEETING

Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Open Meeting be recessed at 6:16pm in order to conduct the Closed In Camera meeting.

Carried.

9. NEXT MEETING
The next Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission meeting is scheduled for January 28, 2020 at 5:00 pm.

10. ADJOURNMENT
MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Castlegar & District Community Complex and Recreation Commission meeting be adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Carried

Minutes submitted by: Audrey Polovnikoff, Recreation Coordinator – CDRD

Minutes approved by: __________ 93 Chair Bergen Price
RECOMMENDATION(S) TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. None.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE PROVIDED FOR CONVENIENCE ONLY AND WILL BE CONSIDERED AT ITS APPROPRIATE MEETING AS STATED.

Future Commission Meetings

2. That the Draft Financial Plan be referred to the January 28th commission meeting, subject to date confirmation.

Staff Direction

3. Staff to provide the background on the relationship with the International Firefighting Games and RDCK Fire Services.
Meeting Minutes

6:00 PM
November 12, 2019
Three Lions Pub

COMMISSION MEMBERS
Commissioner Tawny Sidwell Village of Nakusp
Commissioner Sarah Sanders Electoral Area K
Commissioner Carlee Hughes Village of Nakusp
Commissioner Sheila Seaton Electoral Area K
Commissioner Frances Swan Village of Nakusp

MEMBERS ABSENT
Commissioner Ken Miller Village of Nakusp

STAFF
None

1. CALL TO ORDER
   Meeting called to order at 6:08 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
   Moved and seconded,
   AND Resolved that:

   The Agenda for the November 12, 2019 Rec Commission No.4 meeting, be adopted as circulated.
   Carried

3. CORRESPONDENCE
   Email letter from Chris Dixon

4. RECEIPT OF MINUTES
   The October 15, 2019 Recreation Commission No. 4 minutes, has been received.

5. STAFF REPORTS
   5.1 Financial Report
   Same as last meeting
6. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

6.1 Recruitment - Tabled

6.2 By-law 470 Revision
   Report from Councilor Hughes
   Tabled

6.3 Rec Commission 4 Structure- Tabled

6.4 2019 Spring Granting
   Status of Golf Course grant application updates – still waiting for them to re-apply with more information.

6.5 2019 Swim Program
   Final report from Carlee Hughes
   Tabled

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

7.1 2019 Fall Granting
   Nakusp Ski Hill Association grant application reviewed.
   
   Moved and seconded,
   AND Resolved that:
   
   That the Board approve the payment of the following grants from the Recreation Commission No. 4 Service S228 2019 budget:
   
   Nakusp Ski Hill Association $1,300
   
   Carried

8 **IN CAMERA – No In Camera Items**

9 **NEXT MEETING**
   The next meeting is not scheduled.

10 **ADJOURNMENT**
    Moved and seconded,
    AND Resolved:
    
    The Recreation Commission No. 4 meeting be adjourned at 7:25 p.m.
    
    Carried
RECOMMENDATION(S) TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. Nakusp Ski Hill Association – Grant approved for $1300
The Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 meeting commenced at 7:00 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Agenda for the December 2nd, 2019 Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 meeting, be adopted as circulated.

Carried.

3. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

The September 30, 2019, Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 minutes, have been received.

4. EMAIL MOTION
An email vote was taken November 7th, 2019 asking Directors to vote on the following motion:

**MOVED and seconded,**

**AND Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:**

*That the Board approve the payment of the following grant from the Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 Service No. S230 2019 budget:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Community Resource Society</td>
<td>$2400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email votes were as follows:

- **In Favor**: 6 Commissioners
- **Not In Favor**: -
- **Recused**: -
- **No Response**: 1 Commissioner

The motion was subsequently sent to the Board for inclusion on the Board Agenda for the November 21 Open Regular Board meeting and grant funding was approved by the Board at this meeting – Resolution No. 765/19.

**765/19 That the Board approve the payment of the following grant from the Salmo and Area G Recreation Commission No. 7 Service S230 2019 budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Community Resource Society</td>
<td>$2400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **GRANTS**

Commissioner MacDonald recused herself due to being on the Salmo Ski Club Board.

Two grant applications have been received for review as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Ski Club</td>
<td>$1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Community Resource Society</td>
<td>$2612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOVED and seconded,**

**AND Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:**

That the Board approve the payment of the following grants from the Recreation Commission No. 7 – Salmo and Area G Service S230, 2019 budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Ski Club</td>
<td>$1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmo Community Resource Society</td>
<td>$2612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried.

**STAFF REPORTS**

5.1 **Programmer Report with Salmo Pool Revenue and Expense Report**

5.2 2020 DRAFT Budget Report

6. NEW BUSINESS
   6.1 Meeting Dates for 2020

   Proposed meeting dates for the Salmo Area G Recreation Commission for 2020:

   February 10, 2020
   May 11, 2020
   November 23, 2020

   MOVED and seconded,
   AND Resolved that:

   The Commission accepts the proposed 2020 meeting dates.

   Carried.

STAFF DIRECTION:  Staff to advertise the 2020 Grant Intakes 1 week prior to meetings for February 3 and May 4, 2020 deadlines.

7. NEXT MEETING
   The next Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 meeting is scheduled for February 10, 2020 at 7:00pm.

8. ADJOURNMENT
   MOVED and seconded,
   AND Resolved:

   The Salmo Area G Recreation Commission 7 meeting be adjourned at 7:59pm.

   Carried.

Minutes submitted by: Sabrina Carmichael – Administrative Coordinator, Community Services.

Minutes approved by: [Signature]

Chair D.Lockwood
7:00 p.m.
Tuesday, December 3, 2019
Riondel Community Centre

COMMISSION MEMBERS
Commissioner Gerald Panio Chair, Electoral Area “A” Riondel
Commissioner Wade Wensink Electoral Area “A” Riondel
Commissioner Bill Wallace Electoral Area “A” Riondel
Commissioner Geoffroy Tremblay Electoral Area “A” Riondel

MEMBERS ABSENT
Commissioner Garth Saunders Electoral Area “A” Riondel

Minutes taken by
Gerald Panio

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Panio called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The agenda for the December 3, 2019, Riondel Commission of Management meeting be adopted with the inclusion of Item 7.1 In Camera before circulation.

Carried

3. REVIEW OF MINUTES
The November 5, 2019, Riondel Commission of Management minutes have been received.

4. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS
4.1 Conversion of Meeting Room #1 to Tech use
After a meeting with the committee responsible for the Columbia Basin Trust Technology grant for the Community Centre, it was decided to install the YouTube Studio and Virtual Reality stations in Meeting Room #1. Chair Panio will draw up a work order for Howard Sempf for needed modifications to the room. The use of this room will be re-assessed at a later date when the new technology programs have been open to the public for a period of time.

4.2 Status of Administrative Support position
Chair Panio reported that he would be participating in an interview with one of the two shortlisted candidates for the Administrative Support position. Difficulties with scheduling have precluded a second interview at this time. It is likely that the new Commission secretary will be in place by the end of December.

4.3 Maintenance Report
- Howard will be on holidays from December 9 to December 13. He will still do water testing on Wednesday of that week, and be available for emergencies. Chair Panio and Commissioner Wensink will see to the opening & closing of the Tip-it bins on Monday & Thursday.
- Preparatory work is being done on re-routing auditorium roof drainage.
- Miroslav Doval will being doing back-up plowing for Howard if needed.
- Howard now has remote access to the Water Treatment plant.

4.5 Update on Commission Office Workstation upgrade
Through the cooperation of the RDCK IT department, the Commission office now has a new computer and monitor. The new system is fully integrated with the RDCK network, and all the files from our old computer have been transferred to the cloud and also duplicated onto a flash drive which will be stored in the office. The Commissioners wish to thank David Oosthuizen and Erick Chmara for their assistance with the upgrades and data transfer. Chair Panio said that he would see to the purchasing of a compatible colour laser printer for the office. Approval for the purchase has been confirmed with RDCK staff, Uli Wolff and Joe Chirico.

MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:

That the Board approve the purchase of a new Brother Colour Laser printer for the Riondel Commission of Management in the amount of $500 plus tax to be paid from Service $209.

Carried

4.6 Signage
- The new sign for the hours for the Tip-it bins has been installed at the bin site. Once Howard Semf has tracked down a couple of cameras, the notices in regards to video surveillace at the Tip-it site and the recycling bin site will be posted. Commissioner Wensink indicated that the Riondel Cable Society may have a camera the Commission could use.
4.7 AED update
- The Community Centre AED registration has now been updated online. Both sets of adult pads for the device have been replaced with new ones. The decision was made not to replace the pediatric pads, as the adult pads will still work in an emergency.

5. NEW BUSINESS
5.1 Feedback on December 3, 2019, public water budget meeting with Uli Wolff and Steve Ethier
- The meeting with the public went well. All those in attendance had a chance to have their questions in regards to the budget answered by RDCK staff. Commissioner Wensink stated the budget information presented was clear and accurate. It helped to have budget information covering the last 4 years, on which to base decisions. The proposal for 2020 is a 12% increase in the frontage tax, and no increase in the water rate. This effectively means about a 2.6% increase for 2020, closely matching inflation.

5.2 Missing Carbon Monoxide sensor
- The carbon monoxide sensor which the Commission had installed in the Seniors Room is missing. Chair Panio has made inquiries, but the device’s disappearance remains a mystery. Commissioner Panio will purchase a new sensor later this month.

5.3 Community Christmas Supper
The Riondel Community Christmas supper will take place in the Community Centre auditorium on Sunday, December 8, 2019, at 5:30 pm.

6. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
Due to the ongoing hiring process for the new Administrative Assistant, no report was available to this meeting.

7. REVENUE
Due to the ongoing hiring process for the new Administrative Assistant, no report was available to this meeting.

7.1 IN CAMERA
MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved:

In the opinion of the Board - and, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter –
the public interest so requires that persons other than DIRECTORS, ALTERNTAE DIRECTORS, DELEGATIONS AND STAFF be excluded from the meeting;
AND FURTHER, in accordance with Section 90 of the Community Charter, the meeting is to be closed on the basis(es) identified in the following Subsections:

90. (1) A part of a council meeting may be closed to the public if the subject matter being considered relates to or is one or more of the following:

(c) labour relations or other employee relations;

RECESS OF OPEN MEETING

Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Open Meeting be recessed at 7:45 p.m. in order to conduct the Closed In Camera meeting.

Carried

8. NEXT MEETING
The next Riondel Commission of Management meeting is scheduled for January 7, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved:

That the December 3 meeting be adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Carried

Approved by email

___________________________________________
Gerald Panio, Chair
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Economic Development Commission
Of Silverton, New Denver, Slocan and Area H
OPEN MEETING MINUTES

6:30 pm
Thursday, Dec. 5, 2019
Slocan Village Council Chamber
Slocan, BC

COMMISSION MEMBERS
Commissioner Main Silverton
Commissioner Lunn Slocan
Commissioner Popoff Area H
Commissioner Fyke New Denver
Commissioner Raynolds New Denver
Commissioner Block Area H
Commissioner Fuhrer Silverton
Commissioner Buttle Area H

MEMBERS ABSENT
Commissioner Swetlishoff Area H

STAFF
Ron LeBlanc Economic Development Coordinator
Sharon Butler Secretary / Treasurer

ELECTION OF CHAIR
Leah Main was appointed as Chair of the Economic Development Commission of Silverton, New Denver, Slocan and Area H by acclamation.

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Main called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:
The Agenda for the December 5, 2019 Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission meeting, be adopted as circulated.

Carried

3. RECEIPT OF MINUTES
The October 25, 2018 Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission minutes, have been received.

4. FINANCES
4.1 Financial Statement

The October financial report has been received.

The November final report is available electronically from the Secretary.

4.2 Expenses
The following invoices have been received for approval:
Valley Voice Ad $9.45
Sharon Butler, Secretary $250 (October – November)

Moved and seconded,
And Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:

That the Board approve the payment of the following invoices from Economic Development – New Denver, Silverton, Slocan and Area H Service S114:

Valley Voice Ad $9.45
Sharon Butler, Secretary $250 (October – November)

Carried

5. NEW BUSINESS
5.1 Winlaw Regional Park- Job Creation Project

The letter dated November 4, 2019 from Kootenay Adaptive Sport Association regarding support for a job creation project, has been received.

Area H and the Villages are being requested to commit Community Works Funds as seed money to be used to apply for a job creation grant by Kootenay Adaptive Sports Association for the Winlaw Regional and Nature Park boardwalk replacement project. The project is to take place between March and December 2020. A letter of support is needed to raise additional funds for the project.

The Chair explained that the Commission can recommend to the RDCK board to approve a letter of support.

Carried
Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:

That the Board send a letter of support to Kootenay Adaptive Sport Association who are applying for a job creation grant to replace aging boardwalks at the Winlaw Regional and Nature Park.

Carried

5.2 Community Investment Co-op (CIC)
Commissioner Buttle provided a verbal report regarding the CIC Annual General Meeting that was held in September 2019 with the 15-20 Board members present. This AGM represented the West Kootenay branch of the CIC, which is a separate entity. It is an “umbrella” of sub regions with several sub-committees. The legal structure is now in place to go forward as an Investment Co-op. A marketing plan is ready to launch. Currently $103,000 is in place for lending to selected projects and an evaluation criteria is in place. There has been advice and support from Community Futures and Kootenay Savings. The CIC is looking for additional board and community members. For more information contact Commissioner Buttle.

5.3 Community Directed Funds
The final report and balance sheet from the Healthy Community Society have been received.

Commissioner Fyke reported on behalf of the Society that their remaining Community Directed funds of $23,572.90 were used to create a Food Hub Tool Library. A detailed list of items purchased was supplied and an account balance of zero. The funds were also used by the successful Youth Centre run Mobile Salad Bar at the New Denver Friday market including paying wages and food purchases. It is housed in a trailer purchased with the original funds. The Tool Library is available to community members. This closes the Community Directed Funded projects.

5.4 Chair’s Report: Commission Evolution
The structure of the Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission will be changing as per the recommendations of the Regional Economic Development Strategy put forth by the consultants in our strategic review of 2017. The Commission will be on hold and will not renew appointments, but still do the taxation for 2020.

Chair Main presented a Memorandum of Understanding between Community Futures Central Kootenay and the RDCK with respect to Economic Development in the Slocan Valley that shifts supervision of the program to Community Futures, up to the end of November 2020. The MoU outlines roles and responsibilities of each party as the work of the transitions into a Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will consist of sector and regional representation. The new framework will need further description and potential appointments. Timeline info will be available in the next week. Commission appointments have been renewed to the end of 2020 in order to give direction if needed. The Commission will consist of the elected directors and the role of the Secretary will continue in some format.
5.5 **Economic Coordinator Report**

Ron commented that he felt the move to Community Futures was a positive one, allowing for more access to resources and quicker decision making. He presented the 2019 and 2020 work plans, listing a number of strategic areas with budgeted amounts, timelines and project outcomes. He hopes to improve with reporting and feels CF can help with that. The Agriculture and Cannabis reports that were commissioned will be sent out to Commission members.

6. **PUBLIC TIME**

The Chair called for questions from the public at 8:30 p.m.

7. **NEXT MEETING**

The next Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission meeting is to be determined.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED and seconded,

AND Resolved:

The Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Carried

Leah Main, Chair
Location: Mercer – Celgar mill Castlegar
Time: 11 am to 2 pm
Attendees:
Mercer management/staff – Bill McPherson (Managing Director), Kerry Morton, Christi Jones
RDCK – Director Popoff, Director Hewat, Director Jackman

The session was held to provide Mercer with an opportunity to outline their proposals for innovative projects over the next several years. The session began with introductions and sharing of observations on where forestry operations need to shift to best serve our region. Through the discussion points raised by the Directors included:

- placing an emphasis on minimizing waste
- looking for opportunities to create circular economies
- reduction of air pollution (slash burning)
- carbon footprint reduction
- obtaining the highest value from all fiber
- reducing interface fuel loading
- looking for opportunities to produce renewable energy.

Bill McPherson ran through a slide deck which provided a history of the mill operations and outlined their vision for the future. Some key points were:

- The mill initially went into operation in 1961 and saw a major capital influx around 1993.
- The majority of the mill infrastructure is currently about 35 years old.
- Mercer has taken a corporate decision to only own and operate “top quality” mills with an emphasis on modern equipment, safety and sustainable operations. This requires that Mercer either invest in upgrades in the near term or consider divesting itself of the facility
- Typical annual pulp sales are around $480M based on producing about 1400 tonnes of pulp per day. The mill has never operated to its theoretical full capacity (due to various constraints which would require further capital investment to overcome)
- Three phases of upgrades and innovative enhancements are contemplated but require the right return on investment on the first phase to be feasible
- Phase 1 (shelf ready) is a $125M investment in new storage tanks and process upgrades. This will increase productivity of pulp and green energy
- The current electricity supply agreement which Mercer has in place expires in 2020. The future rate for electricity being offered is significantly lower than the historic rate, creating a disincentive to invest in upgrades
- Phase 2 (engineering work complete) is a $125M to $150M bio-mass gasifier. This would make the mill the first in fossil fuel free operation in North America and could supply significant renewable gas to the market (recall how Fortis gas was recently challenged to meet market demands due to an incident over a single pipeline, highlighting their vulnerability)
- Phase 3 is development of environmentally friendly bio-products using lignin to create plastic alternatives or cellulose nano-fibres to strengthen plastic and reduce plastic volumes in products

Numerous questions and observations were shared through the session. The presentation will be updated based on some of the points raised and will be available for all Directors to review. The Board should consider inviting Mercer-Celgar to present and hold an open discussion at a sustainability committee meeting as several of the ideas proposed have potential to fit with our goals and objectives.
DIRECTORS REPORT
DIRECTOR SUZAN HEWAT

FCM Advocacy Days in Ottawa
Challenges with flight delays from Castlegar and an unplanned 3-hour layover in Vancouver resulting in us not arriving at the hotel until about 1:00 am

Tuesday, November 26th
Registered this morning. Most sessions were closed to committee members only. These were:
Finance and Audit Committee
Governance Review Task Force
Election Readiness Working Group - I was able to attend this meeting as the chair allowed non-members join the committee at the table and participate in the discussions

Wednesday, November 27th
1. Pundit Panel: What the election means for FCM
   The panelists were: Paul Wells – Maclean’s Magazine, Heather Scofield – Toronto Star and Ihor Korbabicz – Abacus Data
2. Committee of the Whole (Part 1)
   - Opening by FCM President, Bill Karsten who welcomed the 3-person contingent from South Africa
   - CEO Brock Carlton walked us through FCM’s election platform
   - Staff member, Carole Saab presented a power point on the FCM’s First 100 days document. This document is available, and a copy can be forwarded to staff for distribution if Council is interested
   - An overview was given of the West Economic Solutions Committee – many members of the BC Caucus spoke about including members from BC in this committee
3. Political keynote by Jagmeet Singh, Leader, NDP
4. BC Regional Caucus Meeting
5. Tour of the House of Commons/West Block
6. Political Keynote by Catherine McKenna, Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Liberal Party
7. Reception with parliamentarians at the National Arts Centre

Thursday, November 28th
1. Political Keynote: Eric Duncan, MP Conservative Party – became a Councillor at the age of 18, Mayor at age and now an MP at 32
2. Committee of the Whole (Part 2)
   - We had a discussion regarding Governance Review Task Force
3. Advocacy Workshop
   - Tim Powers – Abacus Data
   - Mark & Megan (FCM staff)

4. Rural Forum
   Guest: Maryam Monsef, Minister for Women and Gender Equality and Minister of Rural Economic Development
   The Minister spoke about her dual portfolios and how she will manage them both and have them complement one another. Each member in attendance was asked to introduce themselves and say where they were from and what the population of their community was.
   - People were able to ask the Minister some questions before she had to leave for another meeting. There were many questions regarding funding opportunities, especially related to broadband.
   There was an opportunity for people to supply their questions to ministry staff to pass along to the Minister. I shared the success story of the Kaslo Infonet Society and they seemed very interested in making a connection with them.

5. A tour of Telestat had been arranged. This company has worked with the Government of Canada and is developing low earth satellite (LEO) technology. The agreement is that they will assist rural-remote communities in getting low cost, high speed broadband service. I picked up a few brochures, one of which I will pass along to KIN.

6. Board banquet
   Rather than entertainment, a panel of the 3 youngest members of FCM were invited to share their experiences as members of their councils, area associations, provincial/territorial associations and FCM. The youngest of these is 32 years old.

Friday, November 29th
Board of Directors Meeting
   - New board members who joined since September were ratified
   - Verbal reports were given by the President and Chief Executive Officer
   - Reports were provided by the following committees:
     a. Finance and Audit
     b. Member Relations
     c. Governance Working Group
     d. Governance Review Task Force
     e. Policy and Advocacy
DIRECTORS REPORT
DIRECTOR SUZAN HEWAT

- An update was provided regarding FCM programs: Green Municipal Fund and Municipal Asset Management Program
- Verbal reports were given by the chairs of the 5 caucuses
- Canada by the Book – the winner was announced
- CEO Brock Carlton addressed the board and announced his decision to not renew his contract as of July 31, 2020. He first joined FCM in 1991 and has served as CEO for the past 12 ½ years. He will truly be missed.
- The board will now undertake the process required to find a replacement.

Respectfully submitted,
Director Suzan Hewat
Good Afternoon Angela,

Please be advised that at the regular meeting of Council on December 9th, 2019 the following resolution was carried:

“That Council re-appoint Mike Koolen to the RDCK Rosebery Parklands & Trails Commission, as the Slocan representative for the 2020-2022 term.”

It is also important to note that due to the pending restructure of the Economic Development Commission, Slocan Council has not re-appointed anyone to the EDC.

If you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Michelle Gordon
Chief Administrative Officer, Village of Slocan
PO Box 50, 503 Slocan Street, Slocan BC, V0G 2C0
P: 250.355.2277 | F: 250‐355‐2666 | cao@villageofslocan.ca

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:
The information contained in the email is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Its contents (including any attachments) are confidential and may contain privileged information. If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender by reply email and delete and destroy the message.

---

Hello Jessica,

Please see the attached letter that indicates appointments required for Village of Slocan.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Angela Lund
Please think about the environment before you print

This email may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy this email. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the information contained in this email is prohibited.
# VILLAGE OF SILVERTON
## 2020 Council Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Director</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan District Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Arlene Yofonoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Emergency Management</td>
<td>Kerry Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Variance</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kootenay Boundary Regional Hospital Board</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan Valley Economic Development Commission (RDCK Director and one community member)</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Commission No. 6 (RDCK Requires one Council appointment and one community member and alternate)</td>
<td>Councillor A. Yofonoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebery Parklands and Trails Commission (RDCK Director and one community member)</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winlaw Regional and Nature Park Commission (RDCK director)</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan District CoC- Health Committee</td>
<td>Leah Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktunaxa Kinbasket Treaty Advisory Committee (TAC)</td>
<td>Tanya Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocan Lake Arts Council Liaison</td>
<td>Jason Clarke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2020 ACTING MAYOR SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>JAN, FEB, MAR (2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Tanya Gordon APRIL, MAY, JUNE (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Kerry Gordon JULY, AUG, SEPT (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Arlene Yofonoff OCT, NOV, DEC (2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 30, 2019

Aimee Watson, Chair, and Regional Directors
Regional District of Central Kootenay
531B-16 Avenue S
Creston, BC V0B 1G5

Dear Aimee Watson and Directors:

I am writing regarding Ktunaxa Nation treaty negotiations and the ongoing representation of local government on the provincial treaty team by an elected representative of the Ktunaxa-Kibnasket Treaty Council Treaty Advisory Committee (TAC).

As you know, Larry Binks has served as the TAC representative from the Regional District of Central Kootenay (RDCK) for the past five years. I understand that Larry’s continued involvement as the RDCK representative needs to be ratified by the RDCK board in November or December, and that an alternate will be appointed by the TAC committee in February 2020.

During his time of involvement at the Ktunaxa treaty table, Larry has provided valuable advice to the provincial negotiating team regarding local government matters. Larry also has an excellent relationship with the Ktunaxa Nation and federal government treaty teams. Given this, and the need for adequate TAC succession planning as Larry transitions out of his current role by January 2021, I am offering my support for Larry’s continuation in his role for the next year or so, and support the regular attendance at treaty meetings of the Alternate, who will be appointed in February 2020. This will allow opportunities for the Alternate to become familiar with treaty table representatives from the three parties, along with treaty matters and protocols related to the position.
Should you or other directors on the Regional District of Central Kootenay board have any questions about the Ktunaxa Nation treaty process or wish to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact Mark Price, Negotiator, at mark.price@gov.bc.ca or at 778-698-9685.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Alexandra Bamford  
Chief Negotiator, South

cc: Larry Binks
Hello Aimee,

I hope you are well!

The Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative seeks to protect and connect habitat so that people and nature can thrive. We are currently working with a diversity of people and partners in the Columbia Headwaters region of B.C., which includes your community.

We recently commissioned some research to explore the opportunities and challenges in providing for strong local economies while also sustaining ecological integrity. This research focussed on Nakusp, Revelstoke, Golden, and surrounding rural areas, but offers insight for all communities in the region.

Attached is a research brief and full report on the findings from this project, *Exploring Emerging Economic Opportunities in the Columbia Headwaters Region*. These reports are also online, [linked from our press release](#) or here: [Briefing](#) | [Report](#).

The research was conducted through interviews with more than 30 community leaders, includes 18 specific recommendations for land use planning, tourism and recreation, forestry and bioenergy, technology, climate change, and engagement with First Nations. It lays the groundwork for a regional discussion on the intersection of healthy ecosystems, a healthy economy, and the emerging opportunities that may come with a more sustainable approach to resource use.

Thanks for your interest and please let me know if you have any questions. We are also interested in any ideas or resources you may have to share. Please feel free to share these reports with your community members and beyond.

We look forward to continuing to work with, in, and for the communities of the Columbia Headwaters region.

Thanks,

Nadine

---

**Nadine Raynolds**
Columbia Headwaters Program Manager
Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative
Home office: 310 Kildare Street, Box 377, New Denver, BC V0G 1S0
Head office: 200 -1350 Railway Ave, Canmore, AB, T1W 1P6
Cell: 250-551-2546 | nadine@y2y.net

Find Y2Y on [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Facebook](#)
The Columbia Headwaters region is found within the globally unique inland temperate rainforest of southeastern British Columbia.

It includes portions of the traditional territories of the Ktunaxa, Okanagan, Secwepemc, and Sinixt First Nations. Local governments include the municipalities of Golden, Nakusp, and Revelstoke and surrounding rural areas.

This region has many advantages including the creativity and leadership of the people who call it home. Communities within the Columbia Headwaters have the potential to lead the way in finding a path forward in creating a balance for future generations of people and wildlife.
WHO
This briefing is based on a research project conducted between June and November 2019 by Gary Bull, professor and head of the Forest Resources Management Department at the University of British Columbia, and Jeremy Williams of ArborVitae Environmental Services. A research advisory committee made up of diverse regional representatives and provincial and national experts provided direction, advice, and review. Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative commissioned this work.

WHY
The purpose of this research was to explore the opportunities and challenges in providing for a strong local economy while sustaining the region’s ecological integrity. The intention was to lay the groundwork for a discussion on the intersection of healthy ecosystems, a healthy economy, and the emerging opportunities that may come with a more sustainable approach to resource use. The region makes an excellent case study because the current economies are dependent on the sustainability of natural resources for extraction, tourism and recreation.

While much is going well for the region, growth and change always creates challenges and the study area has its share of them. Several resource management issues have emerged. On-going timber harvesting and the expansion of adventure tourism, as well as more widespread recreational use, has increased conflict and challenges in sustaining the outstanding natural features of the region.

HOW
With limited reliable and useful socio-economic statistics, this research focused on interviews with 30 key informants from across the region. These people represent diverse backgrounds, sectors and experiences including local decision-makers, foresters, economic development practitioners, business leaders, recreationists, First Nations, and more.

KEY TAKEAWAYS
Local communities are concerned about having healthy ecosystems and economies and local municipalities, First Nations, and businesses are committed to improving the quality of life in the region while seeking to maintain its natural attributes.

Indigenous rights and interests include ecological integrity and economic participation.

Many interviewees are concerned that increasing levels of recreational land use will lead to greater conflict between users, a decline in the quality of the outdoor experience, and more negative impacts on the biodiversity and natural heritage features of the area.

The study revealed a need for more reliable, useful data such as regional socio-economic statistics including demographic and employment numbers.

KEY ECONOMIC DRIVERS IN THE COLUMBIA HEADWATERS
- Hydroelectric Power
- Mining
- Forestry & Paper Mills
- Tourism & Recreation
- Housing & Accommodation
- Transportation
- Hydropower
- Mining
WHAT’S WORKING
Forestry, particularly in Revelstoke and Nakusp, includes locally managed community forests, important for ensuring various sized companies have access to wood for products.

Local municipalities, First Nations, businesses and residents are invested in maintaining a balance for strong natural resources, growing communities and thriving natural places and wildlife.

Adventure tourism and recreation have added diversity to the economic scene and are bringing considerable wealth to some parts of the region. Communities recognize that limits are needed.

There is an emerging start-up culture to encourage entrepreneurs to explore how technology fits into tourism, forestry and recreation as well as to support workforce skill development.

CHALLENGES
Urgently addressing the management and conservation of mountain caribou.

Ensuring Indigenous people and communities are decision-makers in the future of the ecosystem health and economic make up of the region.

Addressing community challenges related to increases in tourism, seasonal residency, and housing prices.

Reconciling the needs of nature with recreation and tourism use.

Developing new policies and approaches to forest management that balance old growth forest and biodiversity conservation with forest harvest.
RECOMMENDATIONS
Stakeholder interviews and meetings with the research advisory committee found a widespread recognition that the region needs to be proactive to get ahead of current and anticipated challenges that exist. This can be done by building on the strong foundation of knowledgeable people, a stable and skilled workforce, outstanding natural capital, excellent transportation infrastructure, Indigenous knowledge, people committed to sustainability, and an emerging technology sector that can assist in finding more sustainable and creative solutions.

People in the area recognize that now is an opportune time to begin the necessary discussions and organization of what could be a new model for sustainable planning and development.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE RESEARCH

ECONOMIC & LAND-USE PLANNING INITIATIVES
• Collect and compile more reliable and useful data on economic sectors and use of the landscape
• Begin a regionally driven land use planning process
• Include decarbonization imperatives in local and regional planning

COMMUNITY INITIATIVES
• Develop a forum for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to get to know each other and share interests and aspirations
• Increase involvement of First Nations in the local society and economy and explore opportunities to increase their share of economic benefits

RECREATION & TOURISM INITIATIVES
• Establish and support regional backcountry recreation associations and access management
• Assess adventure tourism activities with a sustainability lens

FORESTRY INITIATIVES
• Explore mechanisms to generate local forest-based carbon offsets
• Transition from dependence on old growth harvesting
• Expand community forestry operations
• Increase use of technology to add value to harvested timber, enhance the tourism and recreational experience, and create new bundles of products and services

LEARN MORE
This research brief was prepared based on the findings of an independent report commissioned by Y2Y.
Read the report at columbiaheadwaters.org

Candace Batycki, B.C. and Yukon Program Director
candace@y2y.net | 250-352-3830

Nadine Raynolds, Columbia Headwaters Program Manager
nadine@y2y.net | 250-551-2546

The researchers and Y2Y thank all the research participants for their time, insights, and opinions which helped build an understanding of the region and how it might better prepare itself for the future.
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Exploring Emerging Economic Opportunities in the Columbia River Headwaters Region of British Columbia

FINAL REPORT

Jeremy Williams and Gary Q. Bull
ARBORVITAE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LTD.
Exploring Emerging Economic Opportunities in the Columbia River Headwaters Region of British Columbia

This report was prepared by ArborVitae Environmental Services Ltd. The primary researchers and authors are Jeremy Williams and Gary Bull.

**Jeremy Williams** is a Registered Professional Forester in Ontario with a B.Sc.F. and Ph.D. in Forest Economics. As one of two principals who founded ArborVitae in 1996, Jeremy has developed expertise in forest governance, socio-economic assessment of economies of forest communities, and forest carbon standards and accounting. He has worked in all Canadian provinces, as well as internationally, and has worked with many Indigenous communities throughout Canada. He is very interested in making sustainable development work on the ground.

**Gary Bull** is a Professor and Head of the Forest Resources Management Department at the University of British Columbia. He teaches courses in the emerging bioeconomy and resource economics. He has worked with First Nations in Canada for nearly 20 years in order to bridge the gaps between changing technologies, natural resource management and First Nations culture and values. Gary is also a resource economics specialist working with global forest products companies, the bioenergy sector, UN FAO, several ENGOs, Indigenous organizations and all levels of government. He has worked and undertaken applied research in Asia, Africa and Latin America; as well as Europe and North America. He has prepared over 200 scientific publications and technical reports.
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Introduction

The Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative (Y2Y) seeks to connect and protect habitat so people and nature can thrive. Y2Y is interested in working with municipalities, Indigenous communities, businesses, and stakeholders to implement some of the principles underlying the concept of “emerging economies.” The Columbia Headwaters region in British Columbia is one of Y2Y’s current focus areas because of its outstanding natural features juxtaposed with threats to the ‘sustainability’ of some of these values due to human activities. This region is, in general, economically dependent on its natural resources to support forestry, mining and world-class adventure tourism and recreation, which includes mechanized and non-mechanized skiing, snowmobiling, mountain biking, white-water rafting and backcountry lodges.

Several resource management issues have emerged in the region. On-going timber harvesting and the expansion of adventure tourism and more widespread recreational use of the backcountry have the potential to create conflict between the economic sectors and various initiatives to sustain the outstanding natural features of the region. For example, a longstanding regional challenge is the decline in the local mountain caribou populations, and for some herds their viability is at serious risk. While many people would like to see the caribou survive, there is concern that caribou recovery efforts will have negative socio-economic impacts on local communities. In addition, there are proposals from Indigenous groups to create new protected or conservation areas and Indigenous engagement processes related to caribou recovery and herd planning, as well as for broader reconciliation efforts.

The purpose of this research is to prepare an assessment of the opportunities and challenges in the study area to provide an innovative strong local economy while sustaining the region’s ecological integrity. The intention is to lay the groundwork for a discussion on how to move forward in the region so that both the economy and the environment will be sustained. Y2Y believes that community-based planning can be coordinated and implemented to help mitigate potential conflicts and provide outcomes that are more economically and ecologically sustainable. Such approaches will make greater use of science, Indigenous knowledge, and best practices, continuous improvement and new ideas for sustainable economies. Of course, the researchers advocate that these new efforts should build on the extensive local knowledge and planning that has occurred in the region over the last two decades in particular.

The natural attributes of the region are a primary reason why people choose to live there or use the area for periods of time. The region is also well known for its independence and the high level of engagement of its citizens. All of this makes the region an excellent candidate to explore the intersection of healthy ecosystems, a healthy economy, and the emerging opportunities that may come with a more sustainable approach to resource use.

1 Some jurisdictions are now using terms such as the bioeconomy and circular economy to demonstrate how they are ‘decarbonizing’ and viewing social and natural capital. Sustainable economy and green economy are other terms. In BC, the term conservation economy has been used in land use planning efforts. All these terms could be politically charged, but the essence is to explore a more sustainable and innovative approach.
This report summarizes the researchers’ observations of the key issues and emerging opportunities for the upper Columbia River region and provides their ideas on where they think the emerging opportunities are. The intention is to lay the platform for a much wider ranging and longer discussion of the topics raised; this discussion document does not presume to provide any answers.

**Methodology**

This study was undertaken by Jeremy Williams and Gary Bull, hired as researchers by Y2Y. While they received initial direction and resource support from Y2Y, this report contains the conclusions and recommendations of the two authors. The authors do not reside in the region and do not pretend to have a deep knowledge of it, however, they are both experienced in conducting socio-economic assessments and reviews of forest-based regions and communities.

The researchers began this project by reviewing available studies and information about the region and the issues that are present in the region. Y2Y convened a Research Advisory Committee (“Committee”) intended to act as a sounding board for the project, and at an initial on-line conference in June 2019, the consultants provided a work plan and preliminary observations and received a number of valuable suggestions from the Committee. In late August, the two researchers spent a total of ten days in the region, interviewing a wide range of people, including some Committee members. A presentation of draft findings was made to Y2Y staff and the committee at a full-day face-to-face meeting in late September, and there were subsequent interviews and some additional literature review. In all, 30 people were interviewed. A draft report was shared with Y2Y staff and the Committee and additional helpful comments and perspectives were provided before a final report was prepared.

The findings in this document are based on personal interviews, since much of the basic socio-economic data for the study area was sparse, inaccurate or incoherent. In contrast, the researchers found the interview subjects to be very knowledgeable about the region. Interview notes were discussed by the research team and analyzed to produce a number of recurring themes and key insights which are reported here.
The Study Area

Geography and Administration

The study area for this project is within the headwaters of the upper Columbia River (see Figure 1), including the municipalities of Revelstoke, Golden, and Nakusp and surrounding rural areas. This study area overlaps with portions of the traditional territories of the Okanagan, Secwepemc, Ktunaxa and Sinixt First Nations. The red line in Figure 1 shows Y2Y’s Columbia Headwaters focus area; however, the study area for this research project covers only the approximate latitudinal middle and southwestern portion. There is no “hard” project boundary, but rather a generalized project area.

There are a number of features that the entire area has in common, however the three principal communities are facing different circumstances. The study area has become internationally renowned as an adventure tourism and recreation destination during the past 10 to 15 years, and Revelstoke and Golden have both had large downhill ski developments. These developments have transitioned Revelstoke, and to a lesser extent Golden, from being primarily forestry towns to being tourism and recreation centres. Nakusp, which is smaller and located about two hours south of the TransCanada Highway, is developing its tourism and recreation amenities, such as the hot springs outside of Nakusp and at Halcyon. Nakusp is also re-vitalizing its downtown, but currently does not attract the same visitation as Revelstoke and Golden.

Other more traditional sectors are also present, including mining, CP Rail, and BC Hydro. The area is also attracting young people with New Economy\(^2\) skills, who relish the lifestyle opportunities in the area.

---

\(^2\) The New Economy is a term used to describe an economy built on knowledge and information as opposed to manufacturing. Mobile digital technology and services are considered key New Economy characteristics.
The researchers were also informed that these communities are very independent and that there has been relatively little history of working together and in fact, some history of competition. The absence of many cooperative initiatives was tied by some interview subjects to the impacts of mountain geography on people’s spheres of activity and vision, as well as the different situations and sizes of the three communities. Local government and other administrative boundaries have also tended to divide rather than unite; for example, Revelstoke is in the Columbia-Shuswap Regional District Area A, Golden is in Area B, while Nakusp is in the Regional District of Central Kootenay. Regional communities have also had negligible experience working with First Nations.

Land Use Planning History

Some of the people we interviewed recounted the Kootenay Boundary Land Use Planning (KBLUP) process. The BC government’s web site (BC Government, 2019) has this to say about the KBLUP:

In 1992, the B.C. government directed that a strategic land use plan be prepared to identify a comprehensive and integrated vision for land and resource use in the Kootenay-Boundary region. Recommendations resulting from two land-use tables were used to develop the East Kootenay and West Kootenay-Boundary Land Use Plans released in 1995. The latter plan included a commitment to provide the community of Revelstoke with the opportunity to advise on specific resource management guidance for the Revelstoke District. The Revelstoke and Area Land Use Planning Final Recommendations were completed in 1999.³

The process leading to KBLUP was challenging, as KBLUP was imposed on the region by the province. Early in the process, Revelstoke opted out and instead had agreement to undertake what became known as the MAC Plan (Ministers Advisory Committee). There was also a residue of resentment left by the closed-door negotiations and deal-making that occurred at the close of the process without the participation of the communities. Overcoming these legacies of past land use planning is one of the challenges discussed below.

However, despite the resources put into the development of the MAC Plan, there was insufficient funding and no organizational structure in place to implement it, monitor its effectiveness, or make revisions as needed. This was widely recognized by interviewees as a short-coming that would need to be corrected if a new land use planning process were to be developed. Another short-coming of the planning process was that it did not include Indigenous people, which is unacceptable today.

Demographics

Statistics Canada census data from 2016 shows that Revelstoke has a population of 7,547, Golden has 3,708, and Nakusp is about half the size of Golden at 1,605. Compared with 2006, the population of Nakusp has grown by 5%, Revelstoke has risen by 4%, and Golden has decreased by 3%. What the

³ https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/industry/crown-land-water/land-use-planning/regions/kootenay-boundary/revelstoke-rlup.
Statistics Canada data do not capture, due to the way a “resident” is defined\(^4\), is the army of seasonal workers who are largely employed in the tourism, recreation and forestry sectors. For example, Revelstoke purchased data from a cell service provider that indicated the actual number of people living in town at any one time was roughly 15,000, and one could expect Golden’s population to be underestimated by a similar proportion.

Unfortunately, Statistics Canada census methodology gives a misleading impression of the communities and the number of people living there at any one time. Moreover, these misleading results will affect other data, such as employment statistics, especially pertaining to the service industries.

It is also challenging to obtain data on the proportion of the population that is of Aboriginal origin. Statistics Canada reports that 8.6% of the population in the Columbia-Shuswap area is of North American Aboriginal identity.\(^5\) Within the study area, 10% of Golden’s population is of Aboriginal identity, as is 7.3% of Revelstoke’s population. Although members of the Okanagan, Secwepemc, Ktunaxa and Sinixt First Nations used the region for millennia, prior to Canada’s existence, they were forcibly removed and no longer have villages in the region. There are a number of reserves located outside of the study area.

The consultants reviewed the recent community profiles that have been prepared for Revelstoke (ARIC and CBRDI, 2018) and for the Columbia Basin (Rethoret and MacDonald, 2018) and found that the demographic and employment data in these reports was derived from Statistics Canada census, and so were subject to the limitations discussed above. The unrepresentativeness of the key data for the region and the communities within it led the researchers to produce a more qualitative report based largely on the information and perspectives provided by the interview subjects.

**This is one of the recurring themes of this study: the lack of data for the region that is both reliable and useful.**

**Economic Drivers**

**Housing**

Housing and rental accommodation have changed dramatically in Revelstoke and there are major shifts underway throughout the region. As the area became a travel destination, people began purchasing second homes, attracted by relatively low prices compared with major cities such as Calgary and Vancouver. During the past 15 years, the global real estate boom also affected the region: house prices in Revelstoke have more than tripled while prices in Golden have also increased steeply, although not as severely as in Revelstoke. Escalating housing prices have pushed out some residents and others have

---

\(^4\) Statistics Canada states that “the census counts people according to their usual place of residence. The 2016 Census questionnaire included questions and instructions to determine either the person’s sole residence or their main residence as of May 10, 2016.”

\(^5\) Aboriginal identity includes people who are First Nations (North American Indian), Metis, or Inuk (Inuit), and/or those who are Registered or Not registered Treaty Indians, and/or those who have a membership in a First Nation or Indian band.
moved into less expensive communities, including Nakusp. The emergence of AirBnB and other short-term rental facilitators have led to many long-term rental units being converted to short-term accommodation, since the house owners can make more money. As a result, accommodation for seasonal and other workers has become both scarce and expensive. The impacts that these changes have had on the fabric of the communities are significant and it has created a group of beneficiaries and a group that has not benefited.

Tourism
The emergence of the region as a world-class adventure tourism destination may have occurred over the past 10 to 15 years, but the trend appears to be still intact. More hotels and accommodations are planned or under construction; for example, Revelstoke Mountain Resort, the owner of the downhill ski facility, has a ten-year plan that calls for a major expansion of the complex.

The expansion and twinning of the TransCanada Highway is projected to reduce travel times from Calgary to Golden from approximately two hours and 45 minutes to two hours even, and can be expected to lead to still increasing amounts of tourism and recreation. Another factor that will affect the sector in ways that are difficult to predict is that the owner-founders of many of the adventure tourism companies are retiring and the businesses are passing to new owners, including larger corporate entities. For example, the Selkirk-Tangiers heli-ski company was acquired in 2007 by Revelstoke Mountain Resort. Other companies are seeing similar changes in ownership.

The rugged mountainous setting of the region has a high abundance and diversity of wildlife, however there are significant pressures on at least several of the species, most notably mountain caribou. One of the sources of pressure on wildlife is the high amount of backcountry tourism and recreation, and the ever-expanding range of backcountry activities and the types and capabilities of the equipment and machines. Heli-skiing, cat skiing, heli mountain biking, ski tours by snowmobiles, snowmobiling, snow bikes, mountain biking, white-water rafting, and heli-rafting are all part of the lexicon of adventure tourism and recreation activities in the region. Between all of these activities combined, there is practically no part of the backcountry which is unavailable for use at any time during the year. The researchers were surprised to hear almost nothing during our interviews about hunting or fishing, which are commonly the primary rural recreational pursuits, although many local residents do both.

There are numerous provincial parks in the region, as well as Mount Revelstoke, Glacier, Kootenay and Yoho National Parks. These parks all help to draw tourists to the region; from 2015/16 to 2016/17, the number of visitors at these National Parks increased by 5% to just over two million people (Y2Y, 2017). Although the 2017/18 visitor numbers decreased by less than 1% in Mount Revelstoke / Glacier Park, the 2017/18 visitor numbers represent a 24% increase from 2011/12 (Parks Canada, 2018). These rates of growth are probably generally reflective of rates of visitor growth to the region as a whole.

Forestry
The forests in the region include large areas with high amounts of precipitation, caused by the interaction of air flows and topography. The weather patterns that produce a deep snowpack also support very productive forests: these inland rainforests are unique globally.
The forest products sector is prominent in the region. Local mills provide substantial employment, much of it at high wages. The primary local mills include the Louisiana Pacific mill in Golden (~400 jobs), Downie Timber in Revelstoke (~350 jobs), and Box Lake Lumber in Nakusp (~40 jobs). Other companies in the area include Stella Jones and Interfor and there are several small enterprises that operate with a handful of people or part time and make speciality products. The employment and income impact of forestry operations is substantial (e.g. the mayor of Nakusp estimated that forestry provided 350 jobs in that community) but there is no readily available set of statistics for the study area which would quantify these impacts.

The region is fortunate that it has little lodgepole pine and so was spared the destruction caused by the mountain pine beetle in most of the BC Interior. The abundant precipitation in parts of the region also limits the impacts of fire. In addition, the regional forest sector is diverse, with a wide range of product manufacturing facilities that use the full harvest. Large multinational companies, regional companies and smaller companies are all present, and this diversity provides a higher level of resilience and competition than one finds in areas where the sector is dominated by multi-nationals. Revelstoke and Nakusp both have Community Forests (Revelstoke’s is a Tree Farm Licence that is labelled a Community Forest) which have contributed to the retention of the economic diversity in the regional forest sector.

Some are concerned that much of the wood used to supply these mills is coming from old-growth forests in the region and this results in the loss of habitat. However, a significant part of the regional wood supply also comes from fire-origin stands between 80 and 140 years of age. The debate has been clouded by a lack of reliable information regarding the sources of timber, the types of forests that have been set aside to provide habitat, and what types of stands will be harvested in the next 20 to 40 years and beyond.

Mining
Mining was rarely mentioned by interviewees as a key sector, notwithstanding the large silica mine just outside of Golden. While there are many mining claims and permits in the region, the researchers could not find any information that would indicate the level of activity or investment in the study area. Agriculture also did not enter into many of the interview discussions, even though it is especially prominent further south in the Columbia Valley.

Hydro-electricity
The hydro-electricity generated by the Columbia River has provided substantial economic benefits to the region. Four major dams were constructed on the Columbia River under the 1964 Canada-US Columbia River Treaty. The reservoirs from these dams are entirely or largely within BC. In the early 1990s, regional residents approached the provincial government to ask for a share of the benefits created by the dams, which led to the formation of the Columbia Basin Trust, which was endowed with almost $325 million to support local projects. Today, BC Hydro retains a major regional presence and is another source of high-paying, skilled jobs.

The creation of the reservoirs has had, and continues to have, major ecological impacts. The lakes that have been created due to the inundation of land behind the dams have become obstacles to the travel
of wildlife, notably caribou and salmon, and the fisheries and agricultural potential have been significantly altered. Water control by BC Hydro leads to large swings in water levels that create dead zones along the shores of reservoirs where level changes are large and frequent. The expropriation of land in the inundated areas and the impact on towns that existed along the original river were not well received, and the creation of the Columbia Basin Trust has only partially mitigated these feelings.

**Transportation**

Rail transportation network through communities such as Revelstoke is acknowledged as important but it was beyond the scope of this study to undertake any analysis. Nonetheless we recognize that the existence of such infrastructure creates a large advantage for the communities such as Revelstoke and Golden in transporting goods. It was highlighted that for Nakusp, the lack of access to rail transport is a limiting factor in developing economic opportunities based on natural resources. However, the inland ferry system intrigues and attracts tourists.

**What’s Working**

Other regions in BC and Canada more generally would likely consider the study area to be fortunate in many ways. The economy in the area is quite diverse, growing, and its setting and natural resources are spectacular. The good fortune of the area has not happened by accident, as the communities appear to these external researchers to be well-governed. Throughout our interviews, the consultants were impressed by the leadership and commitment of municipalities, First Nations and businesses in improving the quality of life in the region while seeking to maintain its natural attributes.

The tourism and recreation sector has been much discussed above: it is thriving and driving considerable growth and money flows into the region. The National Parks and the Canadian Avalanche Association and Avalanche Canada in Revelstoke add to the adventure recreation cachet. Residents also recognize the need to limit tourism and manage recreational use so that it is sustainable; the Golden Backcountry Recreation Advisory Committee (GBRAC) was an oft-cited example of a successful initiative in this respect. More recently, Nakusp has constructed a network of mountain bike trails and local trail associations have also formed in the Shuswap region. GBRAC is being re-energized since the agreement needs some updating. The trail associations include many stakeholders and First Nations, which will add to the acceptance of their plans.

Forestry is one of the traditional sectors that continues to form part of the backbone of the regional economy. Some of the mills are innovative and have had recent investment; for example, the LP mill is a laminated veneer lumber mill and Downie makes a wide variety of cedar products, including grilling planks for Costco. Revelstoke has also constructed and runs a district heating system powered by biomass from the Downie Timber facilities.

The area is also fortunate in that the forest licences in the area are not dominated by large companies, and there are Community Forests in both Revelstoke and Nakusp. While large companies have their role in the sector, locally managed forests make different decisions and are usually much more supportive of mid-sized and smaller products companies. The consultants were told that the Community Forests in
particular play a significant role in maintaining the diversity of the sector, since they make sure that the smaller players have access to timber: something that the larger companies often do not concern themselves with.

Revelstoke and Golden are also taking steps to integrate the recently arrived residents with New Economy skills into the local social fabric. The creation of “Start-up Revelstoke” is one of the most developed examples; efforts are being made to link technology to forestry, as well as tourism and recreation. Revelstoke has recently embarked on the development of a Tech Fabrication Lab, which is intended to create opportunities to develop and commercialize new products by providing access to digital manufacturing technologies, tools and training.

Lastly, as also mentioned above, the communities in the area are engaged and have capable leadership. With a healthy balance of interests, the region has a lot going for it.

Regional Challenges
Overview
A number of change drivers have arisen in the region as a result of the emergence of adventure tourism and recreation, coupled with the impacts of forestry. With more accommodation and recreational capacity being built, the continuation of timber harvesting, and with travel to the area set to become easier and faster, these trends can be expected to continue. However, many of the interviewees agreed with the hypothesis that perhaps the carrying capacity of many parts of the area for human use is already exceeded, and increasing levels of use will lead to increasing conflicts between users, a decline in the quality of the outdoor experience, and increased negative impacts on the biodiversity and natural heritage features of the area.

The ecological issue that is widely seen as most urgent is the management and conservation of the mountain caribou herds in the region. Of the five herds in the region, the Kinbasket and Columbia South herds are considered extirpated, while the Frisby-Boulder-Queest herd has ten animals, the Central Selkirks has 24 animals, and the Columbia North herd has approximately 147 animals. Nothing that has been tried to date has been successful in forestalling the decline of these herds. There are multiple factors contributing to the decline of caribou, including:

- Increased habitat fragmentation due to construction and greater use of highways, railroads, and flooding due to hydro development;
- Increased human presence in their habitat, including snowmobiles and helicopters, as well as timber harvesting;
- Increased loss of remoteness and loss of habitat to due timber harvesting and associated resource road construction;
- Increased predation from wolves attracted by increasing ungulate populations and easier predator access to caribou range via resource roads and snowmobile tracks; and potentially
- Increased impacts of a changing climate.
While mountain caribou are most at risk, these factors, and others, could be putting pressure on other keystone species, such as grizzly bears, mountain sheep, mountain goats and wolverines. There is currently research being conducted on wolverines in the region to better understand the population dynamics and potential pressures, and a recent audit by the BC Auditor-General recommends the implementation of a grizzly bear management plan.

The impacts of increasing use of the forest and the backcountry more generally intersect most strongly with the fate of the local caribou herds. Some interview subjects felt that the conservation efforts to date had been overly simplistic in that they focussed on only one or two factors affecting caribou. Government regulations that have been imposed to date have affected forestry (e.g. the researchers were informed that in the central Selkirks, 95% of the high capability winter range has been protected from timber harvesting since 2009 by Government Actions Regulation (GAR) order) but these restrictions have had little impact on adventure tourism or recreation (some areas have seasonal closures to snowmobiling). First Nations have demonstrated a high level of concern regarding the reductions in caribou herds; the Splatsin First Nation was involved in maternity pen programs and one of the reasons behind the proposal by the Okanagan Indian Band to create a National Park Reserve is to provide more protection for caribou. The lack of success with caribou recovery to date indicates a need for changes in approach.

Any solution to the survival of the local caribou will necessarily be complex. The researchers anticipate that the imposition of prohibitions on the use of extensive land areas for caribou recovery is likely not a socially or politically feasible option, although the Okanagan Indian Band’s proposal for a park extension tests that hypothesis.

Recognition of the seriousness of climate change has rapidly gained salience in society at large, especially during the past year and in the recent federal election campaign. One would expect there to be major concern in an area so heavily dependent on winter sports, however interviewees expressed relatively little concern that climate patterns were changing in the study region. There is research that suggests the study area could be less susceptible to climate change than many other regions and so it may continue to receive significant snowfall.

While much is going well for the area, growth and change always creates challenges and the study area has its share of them. The three most prominent challenges that interviewees discussed with the consultants were the big increases in house prices, the shortage of affordable rental housing, especially in Revelstoke, and the threatened status of the mountain caribou herds. These are all aspects of the larger theme at play here: how ‘sustainable’ are the economies and the natural resources of the region? In other words, has the region been too successful at marketing itself as an adventure tourism and recreation mecca? How will this success, along with other natural resource activities, impact the local forest and mountain ecosystems?
Housing and Accommodations
House prices have skyrocketed in many countries, including in parts of Canada such as Vancouver. Low interest rates have supported these pricing gains, as have population increases, growing income inequality, the rise of online companies that facilitate short-term rentals, and Canada’s reputation as a stable rule-of-law country. The point here is that there is little that individual municipalities can do to control housing prices, since the drivers are macro factors. However, like other resort municipalities, Revelstoke has begun to require that new hotel developments include the construction of affordable living quarters for staff, which is only sensible given the shortage of alternative accommodation. Some communities are also creating rules related to short-term rentals. While Nakusp is engaging in initiatives to attract more economic activity and does not have quite the same housing challenges, now is an opportune time to learn from the other communities in the region to prevent the housing and accommodation market from becoming imbalanced.

Indigenous Participation
The Arrow Lakes region was a significant Aboriginal meeting place in times past, with its abundant fishing resources being a key source of food during part of the year. As mentioned, the region is part of the traditional territories of four First Nations, however there appears to be little involvement on the part of the First Nations in the regional economy. This was in part explained by several interview subjects as being due to the lack of reserve communities in the region. In the researchers’ view, there has been little concerted effort made to reach out and engage Indigenous people. Among those interviewed, there is a widespread recognition that an important part of the path forward includes ensuring meaningful Aboriginal involvement in the economy and decision-making. The Okanagan Indian Band has expressed interest in the region with a proposal to develop an Indigenous Protected and Conserved area which, if successful, would include engagement with the local communities and higher orders of government.

Tourism and Recreation
The relatively rapid ascent of the region in the global tourism landscape has brought about a great deal of change. The study team was told that Revelstoke has shifted from trying to attract investment and business to trying to manage what is there now and how new inflows are to be integrated: “from destination marketing to destination management.” Many of the interviewees, particularly around Revelstoke and Golden, also agreed that the levels of tourism and recreational use exceed the carrying capacity of the backcountry, and the environment more generally. User conflicts were beginning to occur, especially in areas nearer to Revelstoke.

The conflicts have escalated due to the lack of recreation use regulations and the increasing impact intensity of many types of recreation and tourism practiced in the region; the intensity affects the quality of the experience. An example is reconciling virtually unrestricted public use of public land with the adventure tourism tenures issued by the province. This challenge has only grown as new forms of adventure recreation have been devised; for example, mountain heli-biking has expanded the area accessible to mountain bikes. Uncontrolled mountain-biking puts sensitive ecosystems such as the alpine at risk, especially when people do not stay on trails. Another challenge is reconciling the needs of
wildlife with recreation and tourism use, and forestry. Forestry tenures and adventure tourism tenures overlap considerably in the study area.

The notable exception for recreation management was in the Golden area, where a local group of tourism operators and recreationists negotiated use limits in a process managed by the Golden Backcountry Recreation Plan Advisory Committee (GBRAC). This initiative was credited with getting out in front of and preventing many land use conflicts and ecological damage in the area.

Tourism also has a reputation of generating many seasonal jobs. There was some debate among the members of the Advisory Committee on how seasonal work and seasonal workers should be considered. Historically, seasonal work has been viewed as less desirable than full-time year-round employment, however attitudes appear to be changing. The study team was informed that many seasonal workers in the study area preferred to have periods when they were not working so that they could travel or recreate; this is not uncommon in the outdoor tourism industry and may also be the view of some of the seasonal workers in the forest industry. However, seasonal workers also have trouble getting mortgages and loans from financial institutions, which creates a challenge for seasonal workers who wish to become homeowners.

The heli-ski and snow-cat industries appear to be attuned to the need for social license. Social expectations on businesses are rising around taking further actions to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with their activities. While some of the companies have focussed on reducing emissions, waste and water use from their lodges, little action has been taken to date to try to reduce emissions from helicopters and snow-cats, other than efforts to fly more efficiently when taking clients out for the day.

**Forestry**

Although the regional forest sector has many strengths and opportunities, there are some challenges for it to navigate. Major policy changes were made in 2003 to the BC forest sector: namely the elimination of appurtenancy requirements\(^6\) and the creation of BC Timber Sales, which was created through tenure reform. These policy changes have resulted in a diminution of the benefits of forestry to local communities. A number of people whom the researchers interviewed felt that the communities in the study region were not seeing many benefits from the forest management sector; with the two Community Forests and the local mills being the exceptions. While the employment at the mills is of course important, it was frequently heard that one or two of the large forest companies in the region were viewed locally as poor corporate citizens with little commitment to the region.

Provincially, the sector is in turmoil as the surge of salvage harvesting of mountain pine beetle-killed lodgepole pine has ended, leaving many parts of the Interior with substantial harvest reductions.

---

\(^6\) Appurtenancy is the term for the linkage that existed between a wood supply and a forest products mill. Prior to 2003, wood supplies were linked to specific mills which made it difficult for a company to close a mill and still retain the wood supply.
Record-breaking fire seasons in 2017 and 2018 have also contributed to the decline in timber supply. Shutdowns and curtailments have been announced in more than two dozen mills in BC.

Policy changes may be coming that could generate more local benefits. The BC Premier noted in his 2018 Throne Speech that the industry’s social contract with British Columbians needs to be re-vitalized and the provincial government pledged to restore appurtenancy requirements (this has not been done yet, however). At the more local level, communities such as Nakusp are seeking to expand the area under their Community Forest license and there is a possibility that this could be done as a joint venture with First Nations.

BC Timber Sales was created to provide market-based prices for timber that were expected to counter the contention of US softwood producers that Canadian timber is sold at below market prices. Unlike forest license holders, which develop their own logging projects including roads, BC Timber Sales develops timber sale projects and auctions off the actual logs. Unfortunately, since the trade issue is political, BC Timber Sales has not led to an appreciable lightening of duties on softwood lumber. In the study area, people felt that because BC Timber Sales accepts the highest bids, the timber it sells is usually cut by contractors from out of region.

Forest harvesting in the study area is highly dependent on old growth. For example, the Revelstoke Community Forest Corporation projects that 90% of its cut will be in old growth for the next 40 years. However, some of the old growth harvesting/silviculture practises are driven by climate and age-related phenomena; namely, the impacts of insects, such as Douglas fir bark beetle, and tree diseases in the forest. This is an illustrative example of a challenge in the region: how do you balance the naturally changing landscape with the need to maintain biodiversity? The project team did not have the mandate to conduct an in-depth analysis of timber harvest profiles. However, it is readily apparent there is public pressure to either reduce the harvest of old growth or to significantly modify the harvesting systems used so that old growth characteristics remain intact. Not only is this impetus coming from conservation and environmental groups, but also from Indigenous communities and the recreation and tourism sectors. It is also associated with forest management actions to reduce emissions of greenhouses gases and combat climate change. There is also growing international pressure showing up in many forums; the widespread burning of the Amazon reminded people the world over of the importance of primary forests. And of course, this challenge loops back to the mountain caribou which depend on old growth, and more broadly, to the potential loss of biodiversity.

**Provincial Government**

The Province of British Columbia issues licences for forestry and tourism on Crown land, sets regulations in those sectors, and makes the land use decisions on provincial land. Interview subjects informed the researchers that the provincial government is perceived as being mainly concerned with the volume and growth of tourism and recreation, and less concerned about the quality and sustainability of the experience. Similarly, the provincial government is perceived as being focussed on maintaining the harvest of timber at the expense of managing the quality and increasing the value of the asset – i.e. the
forest. The opinion was expressed that government needs to shift its mindset from one that is predominantly administrative to one that entails a greater involvement in management.

This attitude is also expressed by the manner in which the provincial government regulates both motorized and non-motorized recreational use: both are largely unregulated, with the exception of some zones where snowmobiling is managed through caribou closure areas. For snowmobiling, some people the researchers spoke with felt that enforcement of these ‘no-go zones’ was lax and the fines for anyone caught in them were the equivalent of the cost of a lift ticket, so they were not necessarily effective. A number of interviewees mentioned the stereotypical ‘out-of-province’ snowmobiler with big trucks, trailers and machines that have little regard for regulations, other users, and the resource. One interviewee pointed out that there is the potential to change this approach by using real time closures informed by animal tracking collars and greater enforcement and fines. Local clubs could assist in these efforts. Concerns were also raised that heli-mountain biking in the alpine was largely unregulated and that these very sensitive ecosystems may never recover from the damage being caused.

A critical limitation in discussing tourism and recreation use is the absence of statistics on the levels and location of use by activity. While tourism operators each have their own use data, these are not compiled on a regional basis. Outside of visitor days reported by the National Parks, which may or may not be reflective of broader regional trends, there is little basis for being able to evaluate levels of use by activity and usage trends. This makes it extremely difficult to try to manage recreational use. A second challenge that would be faced by anyone trying to manage recreational use is that most of it takes place on Crown land, which is available to be accessed by the public. Local residents tend to feel it is their right to be able to go where they want and when they want on public land, and the provincial government has done little to try to manage use.

Similarly, it is not possible to obtain a regional perspective on forestry and on how the forests can be expected to be changed as timber harvesting continues. Timber supply assessments are undertaken for each Timber Supply Area or Tree Farm Licences area, which is logical, however there are no available regional roll-ups of these plans. As a result, it is not possible to tell how much primary forest will be left at any time in the future, nor obtain an indication of what the regional forest will look like in the future.

The researchers heard from a number of interviewees that the credibility of the provincial government is not particularly high in the region when it comes to resource management and planning. The botched public forums on caribou herd management created a lot of division and mistrust that will take effort to overcome, and represents a challenge given the provincial government’s critical natural resource management role.

---

7 Helicat Canada (2019) publishes a statistical summary for the province as a whole; in BC in 2018, 41,000 skiers participated in 118,000 days of mechanized skiing. MNP (2019) estimated that there were 443,000 snowmobiler days in BC in 2018 and that the Kootenay Rockies region accounted for almost 25% of provincial activity.

8 One or more First Nations have existing aboriginal rights to the land as recognized s.35 of Canada’s Constitution Act.
Recommendations

Interviews and meetings with the Research Advisory Committee demonstrated there is a widespread recognition that the region needs to be proactive to get ahead of the challenges that exist. This can be done by building on the strong underlying foundation of knowledgeable people, a stable and skilled workforce, outstanding natural capital, excellent transportation infrastructure, Indigenous knowledge, people committed to sustainability, and an emerging technology sector that can assist the other economic sectors in finding more sustainable and creative solutions. People in the area recognize that now is an opportune time to begin the necessary discussions and organization of what could be a new model for sustainable planning and development at a regional and community level. The recommendations developed by the researchers on elements of solutions and a potential path forward are outlined below.

Land Use Planning

Virtually all of the people interviewed during this project supported the need for land use planning in the area. As described above, many of the challenges facing the region are rooted in land use. Land use planning provides an integrated approach to addressing current challenges and avoiding future issues while at the same time positioning the region to benefit from emerging opportunities. Many people felt that the region has an opportunity to develop a broadly sustainable footprint that will maintain its currency, or brand, as a global adventure tourism and recreation destination.

Land use planning generally would:

- Create a land use plan with several components that is responsive, dynamic and reflects the needs and interests of local communities.
- Recognize Aboriginal rights and title to the land and facilitate those rights on the land base.
- Include access management plans that are enforceable.
- Examine trade-offs between and among economic sectors.
- Identify zones and practices where wildlife conservation is a priority.
- Link to local or tactical land use plans (e.g. Revelstoke Community Forest).

British Columbia has a history of regional land use planning using a provincially prescribed process and under provincial government direction. These planning processes take a long time to result in plans and involve considerable financial and personnel resources. It is not clear that there is much appetite for another such process within government or within the study area. A more workable option might involve a step-wise series of planning tasks with well-defined goals and endpoints that can be undertaken more quickly and with fewer resources. In the meantime, processes which are under way, such as GBRAC, should be supported and offer potential lessons.
There was also broad agreement that planning should be locally driven so that it reflects local values and makes use of local knowledge and insights. However, the process should invite 'outsiders' to evaluate how the process generates plans that are generally in alignment with provincial, national and international goals. The objective is to make sure there is a coherent link between local to global goals. The provincial government was recognized as an essential participant, however, people wanted to ensure that decision-making was locally driven.

There was a strong consensus that any planning process must include First Nations. There have been problems with previous land use plans developed without Indigenous participation and consent. In 2019, First Nations are expecting to have a leadership or co-leadership role to be consistent with the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). First Nations are undertaking initiatives of interest to them and land use planning will need to recognize these. For example, the Okanagan Indian Band has a proposal in to the federal government to create a National Park Reserve that would significantly extend the area of Mount Revelstoke and Glacier National Parks. The extension would be co-managed by regional First Nations, the Province of BC and the Government of Canada. Should this proposal proceed, there will likely be significant land use changes.

As discussed, there is a lack of accurate and useful data on the socio-economic characteristics of the key sectors and communities in the region, including the use of the lands, forests, and roads. Information on recreation and tourism use is essential for there to be a fulsome discussion of land use and access management. A key recommendation is that this information be gathered while the process and approach for land use planning is being determined.

There was not consensus on whether a land use planning process should be regional or at the community level. The role of Indigenous communities in any process is also to be determined. The communities in the study area are all quite different and advocates for a community-level process cited the benefit of being able to tailor the outcome to the community’s circumstances and aspirations. They also cited the lack of regional collaboration on other matters and the greater tractability of a small-scale process. This was especially so in the case of the smaller communities, which often feel ignored or reduced to a secondary status in a regional project. GBRAC was put forward as an effective process, and the consultants feel that the positive assessment of GBRAC was at least partially attributable to its community-level scale. Advocates of a community-level approach also felt that it would be easier to have either the municipality or a local group of citizens lead the process rather than have a regional body undertake planning.

In contrast, a regional process would reflect a number of factors that are regional in scope or impact. Timber flows, wildlife movements, and the choices made by recreationists and tourists are regional. For example, should a community limit the amount of mountain biking, the overflow of bikers will go elsewhere and perhaps overload the use capacity in those areas. Affordability is also a common issue to the region, although to varying degrees. However, there are intra-regional dynamics at play, with people moving from one community to another based on affordability. Another driver of change for the region is the expansion of the TransCanada Highway, which can be expected to greatly increase use of the area.
and increase housing prices as travel times to Golden and Revelstoke from Vancouver, Kelowna and Calgary are reduced.

One interviewee expressed the view that despite a preference to have more locally-driven land use planning approaches, a regional approach would be more advantageous. Determining what the process would look like, how it would work and who would be involved would be critical to the success of the endeavour and would require a high level of discussion and creativity (Bull et al 2018; Lochhead et al 2019). This perspective reinforces the concerns expressed above about avoiding the creation of a process that is too large and time-consuming to be effective. There is a delicate balance involved in triangulating these factors.

There was broad support by research participants that land use planning should be accompanied by the creation of a body or an institution that would maintain and monitor the regional land use plan, and be able to bring about enforcement if need be. Such an institution could be financed by multiple sources over time, including government, business, and philanthropic organizations. People generally felt that the institution should be permanent given the dynamic nature of change in the region and that it should be compliant with best practices in governance, having a governance mechanism that includes First Nations and a wide range of local stakeholders. One model to learn from is the Willamette Partnership (See Appendix 1).

**Recommendations**

- Implement an initiative to collect and compile data on the forestry sector, including projected impacts of operations on the forest under the current forest management plans, timber supply, and employment data, at a minimum.
- Implement an initiative to collect and compile data on recreation and tourism use by area, season, and type of activity, at a minimum.
- Compile and update maps of planned and existing resource access roads.
- Develop an approach, a mechanism, and the local coalitions required to implement land use planning of feasible scope and scale. Ideally, planning would be done at a regional scale, involve First Nations, and be led or managed by a body or institution which would oversee implementation, monitoring and updating of the land use plan.

**Tourism and Recreation**

The proposed land use planning process discussed above includes consideration of recreation and tourism use. One of the potential benefits of land use planning would be to increase the certainty of access to land and resources, and set any conditions associated with access. There was a view expressed by some adventure tourism companies that tenure was becoming less secure, with caribou and First Nations reconciliation cited as the main sources of uncertainty. While there could be considerable variability in perspective among tourism tenure holders depending on location and whether they had infrastructure (i.e. lodges) on Crown land, there would be an opportunity through land use planning to make improvements to the tenures that could help the businesses, facilitate trade-offs, and create value.
The lack of available use data for tourism and recreation constitutes one of the largest gaps identified in this study and it should be addressed as promptly as possible. Because existing levels of recreation and tourism are thought by some to be above sustainable levels, a data collection and management program would be extremely useful in providing some quantification of use that should inform not only the land use planning process but also GBRAC and other similar initiatives.

The discussion regarding land use planning identified the potential for the process to provide an opportunity for modernizing and strengthening tourism tenures. There would be opportunities within such a process to both increase the value of the tenures to current holders and to adjust the benefits provided by the tenure holders. Increasing certainty could lead to higher levels of investment in the sector. These discussions would be supported by land use planning, however in the absence of a planning process, the conversation may still be worthwhile on its own.

For managing the climate change challenge to the industry, the researchers recommend offsetting emissions from operations. It is now a common approach for companies looking to reduce their overall greenhouse gas footprint. In general, many companies prefer to be able to purchase locally generated offsets. One of the challenges to doing so in British Columbia is that the provincial government has not decided on ownership of carbon credits from Crown land. As a result, there are no current links between forest management and forest products and the emissions problem of the heli-skiing industry. However, we feel there are opportunities to work around this obstacle, and it should definitely be explored.

Lastly, for the region to retain its global status as a desirable location for adventure tourism and recreation, the region will need to begin to look more broadly at the sustainability of these activities and the tour operators. The Global Sustainable Tourism Council standards are a good place to start, with there being separate but related standards in place for tour operators, hoteliers and entire destination areas. It is anticipated that the sector will perform well on many of the criteria and indicators but it will have work to do on others. In the future, premium destinations will need to convincingly demonstrate a sustainability ethos, which will in turn maintain the quality of the product and the value of the participating businesses (See Appendix 1).

Action on a number of these recommendations could be supported if the region capitalized on the available adventure tourism expertise to create a Centre of Excellence for adventure tourism. As mentioned, there are many supportive components in place and formalizing this could help the region form an even larger cluster of organizations involved in, supporting and advancing adventure tourism.

**Recommendations**

- Conduct a data collection exercise to better understand the tourism and recreation contributions and impacts in the region.
- Assess the sustainability of the recreation and tourism use in the area using the standards prepared by the Global Sustainable Tourism Council.
- Explore mechanisms to generate local forest-based offsets that can be used by the tourism and recreation sector to improve its net amount of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Create an Adventure Tourism and Recreation Centre of Excellence in the area.
Forestry and Bioenergy

A proposed land use planning process would of course include consideration of forestry. A related issue is access management and either in the land use planning process or in some different forum, the management of resource roads, in particular, needs to be considered. There are over 620,000 km of resource roads in British Columbia, many of which are no longer used or maintained by the industries that constructed them. However, once a road is built, it usually stays passable as a result of use by recreationists. The access provided by these roads is valued by members of the public but at the same time it can create user conflicts and excessive or inappropriately located access leads to negative impacts on wildlife.

There is a network of such roads in the study area and they are exacerbating the impacts of recreation on wildlife, and also providing avenues for better movement of predators, which is one of the factors implicated in the decline of caribou. There would be many benefits if the network of resource roads was reviewed with an eye to identifying which ones should be maintained and which ones should be deactivated, either physically or with the use of barriers or signage prohibiting motorized access.

The regional forest sector should also get ahead of the trends regarding old growth and primary forests by accelerating its transition away from a high level of dependence on old growth and/or finding ways to maintain old growth characteristics in the forests. The very recent appointment by the BC Minister of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development of two individuals to canvass provincial perspectives on old growth is indicative that views are changing rapidly. While forest management practices such as thinning and spacing can contribute to the harvest to some extent, their greater impacts will be realized decades into the future. As indicated previously, the consultants did not undertake a detailed assessment of the timber profile in the region, which would be a pre-requisite for a more informed discussion about this issue.

There has also been a history of variable retention silviculture on some of the management units in the region that could be drawn upon. Variable retention silviculture is a harvest system that retains mature forest structures after harvesting, in order to retain some of the character of the primary forest and improve the biological diversity of the post-harvest area (Beese et al, 2019). While forest companies have generally moved away from this system in recent years, it could be re-established to provide more amenities and habitat after harvest.

Another aspect of the approach to transition the forest sector is to increase the value of the finished product made from each cubic metre of timber harvested, which usually generates more employment per cubic metre of wood processed. The consultants recommend that the technology hubs in the region work with existing local manufacturers to support continued investment and explore the creation of new products and services. Other forest managers besides those in the two Community Forests should be encouraged, perhaps as a condition of their licenses, to make much more effort to support and maintain small local enterprises who make high-value timber-based products. Revelstoke also has the opportunity to expand its District Heating System, and other communities could consider establishing
one. There are opportunities to increase the use of bioenergy in product streams of existing manufacturing facilities and other local municipal waste challenges.

The researchers heard a great deal about the benefits that the two Community Forests have provided. It was advised that Community Forests need to have reasonably sufficient harvests in order to have much impact on the community; an annual cut of 50,000 m$^3$ was considered a minimum threshold by some interviewees. The Revelstoke Community Forest, with an AAC of 78,250 m$^3$ exceeds this threshold, however there would be many benefits to expanding the area of the Revelstoke Community Forest and gradually diversifying it away from primary forest. The Nakusp Community Forest has an AAC of 20,000 m$^3$, and so an increase in the size of that forest could improve the capabilities of the organization and the benefits to Nakusp, while presenting an opportunity to engage with First Nations as venture partners. Lastly, it is recommended that the provincial government should take steps to establish a Golden Community Forest, perhaps in partnership with First Nations. Options include taking back some of the tenure held by BC Timber Sales or other tenure holders in the area, perhaps especially those that are seen as poor corporate citizens. It is noteworthy that a September 2019 report from the provincial forest products industry association, the Council of Forest Industries, recommends the expansion of Community Forests and the increased participation of First Nations in the expansion, plus First Nations being revenue sharing partners in these new ventures.

**Recommendations**

- Undertake a review of resource roads to develop an access management plan, either in conjunction with or separately from the land use planning process.
- Explore approaches for transitioning the local timber harvest away from old growth and/or modifying harvest practices so that old growth characteristics are retained post-harvest.
- Support expansion of the Revelstoke and Nakusp Community Forests and create a Golden Community Forest which is large enough to be a viable entity; explore First Nations partnerships.
- Explore mechanisms to generate local forest-based offsets that can be used by the tourism and recreation sector to improve its net amount of greenhouse gas emissions.

**Technology**

Technology offers approaches and solutions that can be used by local industry, government, and individuals to create new products and services, reduce costs, improve quality and provide transparency. Revelstoke has begun to develop ways to connect the “digital nomads” and New Economy workers who are moving into the area with the local users of the land.

As discussed, there are opportunities to make greater use of technology to add value to harvested timber and create new bundles of products and services. Other countries are actively promoting the emerging concepts of ‘Climate Smart Forestry’, bioeconomy and circular economy. There are significant opportunities in the region to pursue the ‘decarbonizing agenda’ with the technology sector. Creating direct links between existing companies and organizations such as Start-up Revelstoke and the BioProducts Institute at UBC could facilitate and accelerate the adoption of these opportunities.
It is recommended that actions continue to be taken to make sure local economic actors are aware of the efforts of Start-up Labs (e.g. Start-up Revelstoke) and the proposed fabrication facilities.

**Recommendations**

- Explore and support opportunities to make greater use of technology to add value to harvested timber, enhance the tourism and recreational experience, and create new bundles of products and services.
- Regional communities should be given priority for improved access to the digital highway.

**Climate Change**

The large fires in the Amazon this summer and the extensive recent fires in the interior of BC have reminded everyone of the link between forests, people and climate change. Many of the previous recommendations herein have included components that are associated with fighting climate change by reducing emissions. Few people who were interviewed identified climate change as impacting the region in a noticeable way, although there may have been subtle effects to date. Interview subjects informed the researchers that recent climate modeling shows the region may be a “climate refuge” in that the climate may remain more stable in contrast to many other regions in BC.

However, other skiing areas on the West Coast are already experiencing challenges associated with climate change. A study by the Environmental Protection Agency, University of Colorado and a consultant projected that by 2050, climate change will cut ski resort winter seasons by 50%, with the hardest-hit being those in the Pacific Northwest (Wobus et al, 2017). In contrast, the central Rockies and the Sierras may experience the least reduction in the snowmobiling and cross-country skiing seasons.

Miller (2018) reported that ski resorts in the US west have made large investments in snow-making equipment to maintain season lengths and conditions. However, increasing variability of weather is also problematic. Miller continued “…unpredictable winters can still leave resorts reeling. This season, Squaw got almost no natural snow from December to February. Then came a series of big storms that are threatening the all-time record of 212 inches for March. The boom-and-bust cycle of snow in the Sierras has caused...big headaches. Without much natural snow, Squaw had to rely more on man-made snow—which is usually used to cover the base trails, not the steep slopes that skiers and boarders crave. Ideally the season would progress bit-by-bit, spreading out the powder days and the crowds. But big dumps of snow all at once can make travel difficult, and make ski vacations difficult to plan ahead of time.” The expected impacts of climate change on competing winter recreation and tourism destinations can be expected to lead to greater demand for winter recreation in the study area.

The other relevant aspect of climate change is the expectations that people have for businesses and governments to reduce emissions and decarbonize. Local businesses have indicated they are interested in reducing their net carbon footprint and the researchers recommend an exploration of how forest carbon offsets could provide a link between local forest management and the need of local industries to address net greenhouse gas emissions.
More ambitiously, the region can look at what cities and other tourism regions in the world are doing to decarbonize (see examples in Appendix 1), and create a decarbonization roadmap for the local economy that includes all important local economic sectors.

**Recommendations**

- Explore mechanisms to generate local forest-based offsets that can be used by tourism and other sectors to improve net amount of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Conduct research on best practices and include decarbonization imperatives into local and regional planning processes.

**Indigenous Communities**

There is a noticeable absence of Indigenous participation in the regional economy and there was unanimity that this was a failing that needed to be addressed. While everyone agreed that more interaction and benefit-sharing with First Nations was desirable, there are challenges. One of these is the overlap amongst the traditional territories of some of the First Nations, and people recognize this as a complicated situation. At times, because it is not understood by outsiders, it is seen as a political minefield. Some interview subjects expressed their opinion that the Indigenous communities had not yet articulated their economic or ecological interests in the region, however the Okanagan Indian Band’s application to the federal government for an Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area in the region provides a good insight into that Band’s interests; however, there is not broad awareness of this among other sectors. Capacity is an ongoing-challenge for the region’s First Nations; revenue-sharing would provide a mechanism to enable First Nations to develop and hire needed capacity for more fulsome participation.

While there may be truth in these concerns, they need not delay or stop interaction. The researchers feel there is a lot that can be gained by having non-Indigenous and Indigenous people get to know each other and find out what their interests and aspirations are. The researchers recommend that regional leaders invite Indigenous representatives to meet and discuss how they might begin to get to know each other and find opportunities to work together on common issues. As a starting point, it may be helpful to engage with leaders at Selkirk College who already have experience in facilitating discussion with local Indigenous people and with the College of the Rockies where there are Indigenous leaders in senior positions of the institution.

**Recommendations**

- Develop a forum and a mechanism for non-Indigenous and Indigenous people to meet and get to know each other and find out what their interests and aspirations are.
- Seek opportunities to increase the involvement of the local First Nations in society and the economy and provide opportunities for them to increase their share of economic benefits.
Concluding Thoughts
The consultants believe that the study area has an opportunity to differentiate itself from other regions by putting in place a locally-driven, socially-acceptable and sustainable plan for community and economic development. However, there is a significant amount of work that needs to be done to get to that place, starting with addressing some of the basic recommendations, including:

- Implement an initiative to collect and compile relevant data and information to help inform further dialogue, land use planning and other decision making and community planning processes.
- Develop a forum and a mechanism for non-Indigenous and Indigenous people to come together to build relationships and trust in order to be able to work together to find solutions.
- Explore and support opportunities to make greater use of technology to add value to harvested timber, enhance the tourism and recreational experience, and create new bundles of products and services.

Fortunately, the region has so many advantages that it can leverage, including the creativity and leadership of the people who call it home. As ‘outsiders’, the researchers think the region is a globally significant gem and it has a potential to be a global leader in finding the ways and means to a truly sustainable solution for future generations of people and wildlife. It is hoped that the challenges identified in this report are transformed into an opportunity to make a difference that will be seen as a success story for many other regions of the world.
Appendix 1

International Benchmarking of Tourism Destinations and Operators

This study is intended to be both a starting point and a foundation for the residents of the study area, and other interested and affect parties, as they think about what future they would like to live in and be a part of. There was virtual unanimity amongst the people interviewed that there is a need to begin planning for the future to avoid more user conflicts, losses of biodiversity and reductions in the quality of the outdoor experience. A land use planning process, linked to municipal plans, could also contribute to addressing the cost of living and the housing issues in the region.

The study area has become an adventure tourism and recreational mecca because of its outstanding natural features, the topography, and the climate. Adventure tourism is premised on the promise of being out in the unspoiled backcountry, and yet the trends that appear to be in place regarding not only tourism and recreation, but also forestry, may be putting that premise at risk. In other words, the sustainability of the experience is at risk. It is instructive to consider what other destinations known for their sustainability have chosen to do.

Costa Rica has developed a tourism industry based on its natural resources, including coastlines on both the Caribbean and the Pacific Oceans (Verdict, 2017). Estimated to contain 5% of the world’s biodiversity, Costa Rica has retained almost a quarter of the country as rainforest and conserved almost 30% of the country. Costa Rica is planning to become the world’s first carbon neutral country by 2020.

Bhutan has adopted what would appear to be a radical tourism policy in order to avoid a mass influx of tourists. Bhutan describes its model as “high value with low impact”, and it imposes strict entry requirements (e.g. all travellers must come with an approved tour operator) and requires a daily tariff ($65US/day) as a tourism royalty that helps support health care and education (Verdict, 2017).

In 2007 Norway launched a national Sustainable Tourism program supported by Innovation Norway, which has assisted a number of tourism areas to become certified as sustainable (Destinasion Roros, 2019). Oregon has hosted a more regional approach to sustainability in the Willamette Partnership (2019) where the goal and belief is that when “nature thrives, so do people”. The partnership consists of a host of sponsors from industry, local, regional, state and federal governments, NGOs and others. It has created its own unique tools for planning in the region.

The main reason for providing these examples is to illustrate there are different models for developing and maintaining a tourism and recreation sector. These options have the significant advantage that they do not foreclose future opportunities. These examples also have implications for the region. How many and what types of tourists does the area want to attract? How can it position itself to attract more of those “desirable” tourists and recreationists and fewer of the less desirable types? The larger societal context also requires asking: How do you include the perspectives of First Nations in these discussions to contribute further to developing a socially acceptable outcome and increase social capital?
Literature Cited


Earlier today Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, Claire Trevena, announced the opening of a redesigned grant program to boost active transportation which replaces the former BikeBC program.

The Active Transportation Grants Program supports goals set out in CleanBC and Move. Commute. Connect. – B.C.’s strategy for cleaner, more active transportation.

This cost sharing grant program provides funding for network planning (up to $50,000) and infrastructure development (up to $500,000) for communities as follows:

- 80% Indigenous communities or their local government(s) partners
- 70% Population less than 15,000
- 60% Population between 15,000 to 25,000
- 50% Population over 25,000

Indigenous and local governments are invited to submit funding proposals to B.C.’s Active Transportation Grants Program until February 20, 2020 at 11:59 p.m.

For program details and to apply please visit B.C. Active Transportation Infrastructure Grants Program.

If you have any questions or require assistance with your application please contact program staff at BCATgrants@gov.bc.ca or by telephone at 778 974-5469.
Regional District Chair and Directors
Regional District of Central Kootenay
Box 590
202 Lakeside Drive
Nelson, BC V1L 5R4

Dear Regional District Chair and Directors,

Re: 17th Annual BC Natural Resources Forum – Invitation – January 28th to 30th, 2020

We are pleased to invite you to attend the 17th Annual BC Natural Resources Forum January 28th – 30th, 2020. The annual event is hosted at the Prince George Conference and Civic Centre. The Forum is the largest natural resource conference in Western Canada attracting over 1,000 delegates representing almost 500 different organizations.

The 2020 Forum includes many high caliber speakers including Chief Councillor Crystal Smith, Haisla Nation; Peter Zebodee, CEO, LNG Canada; James Thompson, Vice President, Western Region, CN; Alan Dunlop, Vice President, Asset Development Chevron Canada; Michael Crothers, President & Country Chair, Shell Canada; Affonso Bizon, General Manager, Rio Tinto BC Works as well as a keynote address from Premier John Horgan. We are also pleased to be hosting five of British Columbia’s resource sector Ministers at the popular and always sold-out Ministers’ Breakfast.

A key contributor of the Forum’s huge success as the largest natural resources forum in Western Canada is the unprecedented participation of a large contingent of Indigenous leaders, all levels of Government and the broad cross section of the resource sectors. There is no other gathering that provides this diversity of speakers, delegates, exhibitors and leaders under one roof to explore issues, challenges and opportunities facing BC’s and Western Canada’s dynamic resource sectors. The Forum is recognized for its ability to foster respectful discussion about the vital importance of the Northern economy. It sets the stage for new relationships and facilitates productive dialogue about new business and community opportunities. The high caliber speakers, sold-out trade show and sold-out keynote dinner, lunches and breakfast, reflect the relevance of this event.

We hope you will consider attending the 2020 Forum for the opportunity to be part of the discussion on cross-sector solutions and help shape the future of the Province’s resource economy. For more information on the BC Natural Resources Forum and to register, please visit https://bcnaturalresourcesforum.com.

Sincerely,

Dan M. Jepsen, RPF
Director & Co-Founder, C3 Alliance Corp.

www.bcnaturalresourcesforum.com
November 25, 2019

Adam Casemore
Director-Area C, Regional District Central Kootenay
Box 590
Nelson, BC V1L 5R4

Dear Adam Casemore:

Thank you for meeting with the Ministry of Citizens’ Services at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) conference on September 25th in Vancouver and discussing the concerns from the Regional District Central Kootenay regarding the lack of cellular service along Kootenay Pass.

The Government of British Columbia recognizes the importance of cellular connectivity along provincial highways and in rural communities, especially for public safety. We know that cell service along highways ensures there is immediate access to emergency services when they are needed most. However, highway safety is the responsibility of many, and due diligence is part of the solution for safety. The Ministry of Transportation is currently deploying a number of technologies that can assist with this including wi-fi at highway rest areas, web cams and the DriveBC website which provides travelers with current road conditions that they can check prior to leaving for their destination. Drivers are encouraged to ensure that they are prepared and understand where there is cellular coverage.

In BC, there are thousands of kilometres of primary and secondary highways in rural areas that do not have cellular coverage. About 70% of these highway segments also don’t have the power needed to support cell towers. This includes the area in the Kootenay Pass that does not have cellular service. A sustainable long-term plan to provide cellular in these areas without power requires all levels of government to work together on a solution.

In Canada, telecommunications companies are regulated by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC). Recently, in a CRTC decision, it was acknowledged that all Canadians should have access to voice services and internet access services on both fixed and cellular wireless networks. At a national level, the solution is being studied by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) including the cost of cellular services expansion.
The Province is working closely with telecommunications companies and with the Government of Canada to lay the groundwork – through broadband infrastructure – to help internet service providers connect more BC communities to cellular coverage. Recently, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission issued a second call for applications of the $750-million Broadband Fund. Intake details can be found here: https://crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2019/2019-372.htm. We are also working with the three cellular providers in BC – TELUS, Rogers and Shaw – on solutions to expand cellular coverage.

We would encourage you to connect with Rob Gay, Chair of the Columbia Basin Broadband Committee, as this committee has a connectivity plan for the Columbia Basin area. Cellular coverage in rural communities and along highways should be prioritized for future investments with the federal government, corporate partners and communities. As the CRTC’s Broadband Fund supports expanding cellular, it is important for communities to make their voices heard by both the CRTC and cellular providers.

Thank you again for meeting with us at UBCM and for identifying the need for reliable cellular service in your area. In the meantime, if you have any questions regarding connectivity programs, please contact Howard Randell at 250 415-6867, or by email at NetworkBC@gov.bc.ca.

Sincerely,

Selina Robinson
Minister

pc: Diana Lockwood, Director-Salmo
   Regional District of Central Kootenay

Hans Cunningham, Director-Area G
   Regional District of Central Kootenay

Susan Stanford, Assistant Deputy Minister
   Ministry of Citizens’ Services

Howard Randell, Executive Director, Network BC
   Ministry of Citizens’ Services
Kootenay Forest Sector Collaboration
Meeting Summary for November 26, 2019

Overview:

November 26 was the first meeting to discuss collaborating for a thriving Kootenay Forest sector and was attended by 45 people representing Indigenous Nations, local government, provincial government, labour and industry. See Appendix 1 for a list of the meeting attendees who represent the Cranbrook, Invermere and Kootenay Lake TSAs.

An opening prayer and remarks were provided by Sophie Pierre (O.C., O.B.C.), a former chief of the St. Mary’s Band, now known as ?aq’am and is a member of the Ktunaxa Nation.

Remarks were also provided by Rick Manwaring, Associate Deputy Minister with the Government of BC and Don Kayne, President and CEO of Canfor.

What Does Success Look Like?

The group brainstormed what success from the collaboration could look like by 2025. There were many similar ideas expressed and the majority of ideas focused on the following themes.

Access to fibre
- Predictable and secure access to fibre
- Access to the land base
- Sharing the fibre
- Healthy sawmilling and pulp sectors

Indigenous participation and partnerships
- Revenue sharing
- Shared decision making
- Meaningful recognition of UNDRIP (rights & title)
- True government to government agreement
- Indigenous Nations as a gatekeeper to fibre access
- Partnerships between Indigenous Nations and companies that are profitable for both and recognize each other’s unique interests

Increased utilization
- Utilization of all fibre supplies for maximized value
- Reduced waste wood

Stewardship
- Better coordination with all forest users
- Long-term management of the forest with sustainable practices
- A healthy and sustainable timber supply
Community
- Employment opportunities
- Strong skilled labour supply
- Revenue sharing

Diversification
- Diversity of industry and products with a range of players
- More smaller businesses that produce more jobs with our high value fibre

Long term vision for the industry
- Working together with the goal of sharing all ideas from all parties and looking outside the box
- Finding common ground within the group
- Clear vision for forest industry
- The softwood lumber agreement is no longer an issue
- Integration of technology and users to achieve common goals
- Promote the value of our industry
- Continuing to meet the BC government’s carbon objectives

Actions to Help Achieve Success

The group brainstormed actions to help achieve success of a thriving forestry sector. There were many similar ideas expressed and the majority of ideas focused on the following themes.

Access to fibre
- Certainty of fibre supply
- Identify and secure the working forest
- THLB reassessment to enhance AACs

Indigenous participation and partnerships
- Provide clarity on the implementation of UNDRIP
- Ensure fairness and respect
- Improved revenue sharing
- Conduct archaeological impact assessments

Increased utilization
- Implement incentives for high utilization and low waste levels
- Improve utilization to the primary and secondary user
- Improve waste wood utilization
- Modify utilization standards to recognize Indigenous Nations
- Eliminate the export of logs across the border

Add value
- Ensure every log goes to its best end use with a focus on value
- Establish more value-added processing plants
- Expand opportunities for extracting added value from the forest (e.g. steep slope harvesting)
- Create the conditions to attract investment and add value
Stewardship
- Create a shared understanding of stewardship of the land
- Update the forest inventory
- Improve reclamation (e.g. return forest roads to their original state)
- Change the requirements for replanting on private lands

Community
- Implement a fire proofing strategy for local community safety
- Demonstrate the science behind good fire smarting
- Increase tenure diversification that ties more fibre and benefits to communities
- Industry participation in fuel management

Stumpage system
- Have a stumpage system that is more reactive to the current market
- Have more transparency on stumpage rates
- Fix stumpage rates for pulp logs

Diversification
- Diversify the industry
- Enhance regional fibre flows/opportunities

Long term vision for the industry
- Collaborate on longer-term forestry planning
- Implement a communications strategy
- Speaking with one unified industry voice to gain traction with ideas with the Province

Meeting Outcomes:
- There was agreement to continue working together to achieve tangible outcomes to further strengthen and diversity the Kootenay forest sector
- There was agreement that recognition and respect for Indigenous rights and title is critical
- There was agreement to structure the efforts of the group with a big group and small group to move the initiative forward
- The small group will begin by serving as the Interim Steering Committee (ISC) for which members were selected (see Appendix 2 for list of names)
- The big group will meet quarterly and the next meeting should be scheduled for Spring 2020
- The ISC will provide updates to the big group between quarterly meetings

Next Steps:
- The ISC will meet before the end of December
- The ISC will develop terms of reference for the group, which will be circulated in advance of the next big group meeting
- The ISC will develop a preliminary work plan and consider potential working groups to propose to the big group
### Appendix 1 – Meeting Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATCO</td>
<td>Scott Weatherford</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCO</td>
<td>Mark Semeniuk</td>
<td>COO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Don Kayne</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Stephen Mackie</td>
<td>Senior Vice President, Canadian Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Mark Feldinger</td>
<td>Senior Vice President, Global Supply Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Ross Lennox</td>
<td>Vice President, Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Michelle Ward</td>
<td>Director, Corporate Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CanWel</td>
<td>Amar Doman</td>
<td>Chairman &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CanWel</td>
<td>Steve Marshall</td>
<td>VP Treated Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;C Wood Products</td>
<td>Jim Leonidas</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay Regional District</td>
<td>Garry Jackman</td>
<td>Area Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasse Holdings</td>
<td>Jacques Chasse</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasse Holdings</td>
<td>Brady Chasse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cranbrook</td>
<td>Lee Pratt</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cranbrook</td>
<td>Darren Brewer</td>
<td>Business Development Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nelson</td>
<td>John Dooley</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay Regional District</td>
<td>Stan Doehle</td>
<td>Director Area B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway Lumber</td>
<td>Brian Fehr</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of BC</td>
<td>Rick Manwaring</td>
<td>Associate Deputy Minister, Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of BC</td>
<td>Ray Morello</td>
<td>District Manager, Kootenays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of BC</td>
<td>Garry Beaudry</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH Huscroft</td>
<td>Karl Sommerfeld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH Huscroft</td>
<td>Justin Storm</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalesnikoff Lumber</td>
<td>Ken Kalesnikoff</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalesnikoff Lumber</td>
<td>Dwane Sorenson</td>
<td>GM Fibre Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktunaxa Nation Council</td>
<td>Greg Johnson</td>
<td>Guardian Team Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktunaxa Nation Council</td>
<td>Ray Warden</td>
<td>Director, Lands and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardis Forest Products</td>
<td>Larry Gould</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardis Forest Products</td>
<td>Nonja Gould</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Celgar</td>
<td>Stan Hadikin</td>
<td>Fibre Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Excellence</td>
<td>Quinton Hayward</td>
<td>Chief Forester - BC Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Excellence</td>
<td>Brian Baarda</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Excellence</td>
<td>Gavin Baxter</td>
<td>Plant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Profiles</td>
<td>Mohsin Ejaz</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Profiles</td>
<td>Thor Bjarnason</td>
<td>Plant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcupine Wood Products</td>
<td>Craig Upper</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPWC Local 15</td>
<td>Tim Strachan</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Lorena Tegart</td>
<td>Manager of Territorial Operations &amp; Intergovernmental Stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Barbara Cote</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Mark Thomas</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Tim Eugene</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Diane Thomas</td>
<td>Referrals Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USW Local 1-405</td>
<td>Doug Singer</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USW Wood Council</td>
<td>Jeff Bromley</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Canal Flats</td>
<td>Karl Sterzer</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Radium Hot Springs</td>
<td>Clara Reinhardt</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 – Interim Steering Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canfor</td>
<td>Ross Lennox</td>
<td>Vice President, Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cranbrook</td>
<td>Darren Brewer</td>
<td>Business Development Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nelson</td>
<td>John Dooley</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of BC</td>
<td>Rick Manwaring</td>
<td>Associate Deputy Minister, Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of BC</td>
<td>Ray Morello</td>
<td>District Manager, Kootenays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalesnikoff Lumber</td>
<td>Ken Kalesnikoff</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalesnikoff Lumber</td>
<td>Dwane Sorenson</td>
<td>GM Fibre Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ktunaxa Nation Council</td>
<td>Greg Johnson</td>
<td>Guardian Team Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Excellence</td>
<td>Quinton Hayward</td>
<td>Chief Forester - BC Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcupine Wood Products</td>
<td>Craig Upper</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPWC Local 15</td>
<td>Tim Strachan</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>Ray Cormier</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USW Local 405</td>
<td>Doug Singer</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 27, 2019

Chair Aimee Watson
Central Kootenay Regional District
Box 590
Nelson, BC V1L 5R4

Dear Chair Aimee Watson:

RE: GAS TAX AGREEMENT COMMUNITY WORKS FUND PAYMENT

I am pleased to advise that UBCM is in the process of distributing the second Community Works Fund (CWF) payment for fiscal 2019/2020. An electronic transfer of $677,921.32 is expected to occur within the next 30 days. These payments are made in accordance with the payment schedule set out in your CWF Agreement with UBCM (see section 4 of your Agreement).

CWF is made available to eligible local governments by the Government of Canada pursuant to the Administrative Agreement on the Federal Gas Tax Fund in British Columbia. Funding under the program may be directed to local priorities that fall within one of the eligible project categories.

Further details regarding use of CWF and project eligibility are outlined in your CWF Agreement and details on the Gas Tax Agreement can be found on our website at www.ubcm.ca.

For further information, please contact Gas Tax Program Services by e-mail at gastax@ubcm.ca or by phone at 250-356-5134.

Yours truly,

Maja Tait
UBCM President

PC: Stuart Horn, Chief Administrative Officer
To:

Mayor John Dooley and City of Nelson Councillors.

Nelson, BC

December 3, 2019

Dear Mayor Dooley and Councillors

Re: The health and safety of Nelson Citizens and the health of the Nelson Environment, and the related need for a substantial improvement of Active Transportation in Nelson and Area.

The Kootenay Lake Hospital Medical Staff on November 14, 2019, at the KLH Medical Staff meeting, unanimously supported a motion that the Medical Staff write to the City Council to encourage plans and actions to substantially improve year-round conditions for pedestrians and cyclists to walk and cycle easily and safely in town and especially from the neighbourhoods to downtown. We are aware that the City is in the process of upgrading the Active Transportation Plan (first developed in 2010) and that there is a strong intent to significantly improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians.

We, as health care providers, want to emphasize that active transportation such as walking and cycling, is fundamental to improved physical and emotional health of Nelson citizens. One can expect reduced rates of chronic sedentary-lifestyle related disease with improved cardiovascular health, higher levels of musculoskeletal fitness, better mental and emotional well-being and less vehicle related accidents. Less use of cars, is additionally fundamental to improved health of our environment and climate, which again directly improves the health of people. These are also the recognized positions of the College of Family Physicians of Canada.

Research has shown that improved conditions for cycling (e.g. cycle lanes) result in up to 80% increased rate of cycling as well as up to 80% reduced rate of cycling accidents. People often do not cycle or walk because it is not safe to do so; also because it is too complicated and not sufficiently user-friendly to do.
It is clear that the amount of traffic in our main streets and lack of parking is already very problematic, and will inexorably get worse. This will adversely affect the wellbeing of Nelsenites. High rates of cycling and walking will ameliorate this problem.

We feel strongly that the City's actions to improve active transportation should have the highest priority, should be done expeditiously (completed within a few years), should be comprehensive, should be thorough and should be robustly funded. We understand that improved conditions will require a comprehensive system of bicycle and pedestrian routes, dedicated bicycle lanes, bike parking facilities, good signage and scrupulously keeping the pedestrian and cycling routes and lanes clear of snow and ice.

We appreciate the hard and exciting work currently being done by the City Leadership and Administration and also by the West Kootenay Cycling Coalition.

Sincerely,

Dr Greg Hand, President of KLH Medical Staff

Dr Jim Wiedrick, Chief of Staff KLH

Dr Andrew Murray, Medical Staff Member with interest in Active Transportation.

CC RDCK Board Chair and Directors
Dear Mr. Horn,

RE: Quarterly Report: July 1 – September 30, 2019

This package of documents details the complaint files the Office of the Ombudsperson closed for the Regional District of Central Kootenay between July 1 and September 30, 2019. This package does not include information about complaint files that are currently open with our office. As required by the Ombudsperson Act, this report provides information about the complaint files we closed regarding your organization within the last quarter, including both files we investigated and files we closed without investigation. No action is required on your part, however we hope that you will find this information useful and share it within your organization.

Enclosed you will find a detailed report containing the following:

- The number of files our office closed in the last quarter regarding your organization and the category under which these files were closed. The categories we use to close files are based on the sections of the Ombudsperson Act, which gives the Ombudsperson the authority to investigate complaints from the public regarding authorities under his or her jurisdiction. A more detailed description of our closing categories is available on our website at: https://bcomombudsperson.ca/qr-glossary.

- If applicable, copies of all closing summaries from investigated files that were closed during the last quarter. Our office produces closing summaries for investigated files only, and not for enquiries or those we choose not to investigate. These summaries provide an overview of the complaint received, our investigation and the outcome.

- If applicable, a summary of the topics identified in all complaints that were closed in the last quarter for your organization. Our office tracks the topics of complaints we investigate and those we close without investigation (we do not track this information for enquiries). We track general complaint topics for all complaints we receive, and when applicable, we include authority-specific and/or sector-specific topics for your organization and/or sector. Because complaints are confidential, we do not share complaint topic information if we received too few complaints to preserve the complainants' anonymity.
If you have questions about our quarterly reports, or if you would like to sign up for our mailing list to be notified of educational opportunities provided by our Prevention Initiatives Team, please contact us at 250-508-2950 or consult@bcombudsperson.ca.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Jay Chalke
Ombudsperson
Province of British Columbia

Enclosures
Quarterly report for Regional District of Central Kootenay for July 1 – September 30, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of complaint closure</th>
<th># closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enquiries</strong> – Many people who contact us are not calling to make a complaint, but are seeking information or advice. These contacts are classified as <em>Enquiries</em> to distinguish them from <em>Complaints</em>, which are requests that our office conduct an investigation.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaints with No Investigation</strong> – Our office does not investigate every complaint it receives. First, we determine whether we have authority to investigate the complaint under the <em>Ombudsperson Act</em>. We also have discretion to decline to investigate for other reasons specified in the <em>Ombudsperson Act</em>.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Resolution Investigations</strong> – Early Resolution investigations provide an expedited process for dealing with complaints when it appears that an opportunity exists for the authority to take immediate action to resolve the issue. Typical issues that are addressed through Early Resolution include timeliness, communication, and opportunities for internal review.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complaint Investigations</strong> – When we investigate a complaint we may conclude with a determination that a complaint is not substantiated, or with a negotiated settlement of the complaint, or with public findings and recommendations. We may also exercise discretion to cease investigation for a number of other reasons specified in the <em>Ombudsperson Act</em>.</td>
<td>Total: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for closing an Investigation**

- Pre-empted by existing statutory right of appeal, objection or review. 0
- Investigation ceased with no formal findings under the *Ombudsperson Act*. 0
- More than one year between event and complaint 0
- Insufficient personal interest 0
- Available remedy 0
- Frivolous/ vexatious/trivial matter 0
- Can consider without further investigation 0
- No benefit to complainant or person aggrieved 0
- Complaint abandoned 0
- Complaint withdrawn 0
- **Complaint settled in consultation with the authority** - When an investigation leads us to conclude that action is required to resolve the complaint, we try to achieve that resolution by obtaining the voluntary agreement of the authority to settle the complaint. This allows matters to be resolved fairly for the complainant and authority without requiring a formal finding of maladministration. 0

- Complaint substantiated with formal findings under the *Ombudsperson Act*. 0
- Complaint not substantiated under the *Ombudsperson Act*. 0

**Ombudsperson Initiated Investigations** – The Ombudsperson has the authority to initiate investigations independently from our process for responding to complaints from the public. These investigations may be ceased at the discretion of the Ombudsperson or concluded with formal findings and recommendations. 0

For more detailed information about the complaint closing categories used by our office, please see our glossary of terms at: https://www.boombudsperson.ca/resources/information-public-bodies/fairness-quick-tips. To obtain a more detailed breakdown of the complaints closed for your authority for the quarter, please contact us at consult@boombudsperson.ca.
Complaints Closed from July 1, 2019 to September 30, 2019
All Local Government
Regional District of Central Kootenay

The tables below summarize the complaint topics we are tracking for your sector and/or authority and the number of times this topic was identified in the files (investigated and non-investigated complaints) that were closed in the most recent quarter.

If you would like more information on the types of complaints we receive, please contact our Prevention Initiatives Team: email us at consult@bcmbudsperson.ca or call us at 250-508-2950.

### Sector-Specific Complaint Topics - All Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Enforcement</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Conduct (incl. Conflict of Interest)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Community Plan/Zoning/Development</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees/Charges (incl. Taxes)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (incl. Garbage, Sewer, Water)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Damages Claim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Complaint Topics - All Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision/Outcome - Disagreement with</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative error</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment by staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Procedure</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint/Review/Appeals Process</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/Labour Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 5, 2019

Chair Watson and Board
Central Kootenay Regional District
Box 590
Nelson, BC, V1L 5R4

**RE: Completion of Community Wildfire Protection Plan Project (SWPI-808: RDCK Area C CWPP Update, 2017)**

Dear Chair Watson and Board,

Thank you for submitting final report documentation for the completion of the above noted Community Wildfire Protection Plan project. The Strategic Wildfire Prevention Working Group has reviewed your submission and the reporting requirements have been met.

The final report notes total project costs of $30,000.00. Based on this, payment in the amount of $22,500.00 will follow shortly by electronic funds transfer. This payment represents full payment for the project and is based on seventy-five per cent (75%) of total eligible costs.

On behalf of the Working Group, I congratulate you on the successful completion of this project and offer best wishes for future community safety work in your community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Peter Ronald
Program Officer

cc: Joel Hamilton, Wildfire Mitigation Supervisor, Central Kootenay Regional District
    Mike Morrow, Wildfire Prevention Officer, Southeast Fire Centre

*The Strategic Wildfire Prevention Initiative is funded by the Province of BC*
December 12, 2019

Ref.: 107890

Aimee Watson
Chair
Regional District of Central Kootenay

Email: awatson@rdck.bc.ca

cc: Peter.Robb@gov.bc.ca

Dear Ms. Watson:

I am writing to thank you and your Directors for meeting with me at the Union of British Columbia Municipalities Convention, which was held from September 23 to 27, 2019 in Vancouver.

During the meeting, we discussed the HB Mine facility closure and reclamation. The Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources is supportive of the District’s effort to close the tailings facility. I am pleased to note that Alayne Hamilton, the District’s HB Tailings Facility Technologist, has been in contact with Mr. Peter Robb, Assistant Deputy Minister, Mines, Competitiveness and Authorizations Division, and that an application review meeting with Ministry staff took place on November 5, 2019.

Ministry technical staff will continue to work with the District regarding the closure of the facility. Thank you for raising this important issue with me.

Sincerely,

Michelle Mungall
Minister
December 18, 2019

Honourable Katrine Conroy
Minister of Children & Family Development
PO Box 9422 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria, BC, V8W 9V1

Honourable Katrina Chen
Minister of State for Childcare
PO Box 9422 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria, BC, V8W 9V1

RE: $10 a Day Child Care Plan

Dear Ministers,

Childcare in the Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District (ACRD) is a top concern for young families. This influences the recruitment and retention of young families in our community and our overall economic prosperity. While increasing the number of affordable childcare spaces is a need, we must also support the development of safe, nurturing environments and the early year’s profession, which employs numerous individuals in our region.

This was highlighted at the regular ACRD Board of Directors meeting of November 27, 2019 where the following resolution was adopted:

“THAT the Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District Board of Directors write the provincial government and request they expedite the $10aDay Child Care Plan implementation universally and play an active role in advocating for provincial level changes and cc all local governments.”

Results of the 2019 ACRD Child Care Needs Assessment (attached) validate the economic and social toll of the current childcare system. This necessitates significant investment and focused activities to both increase the number of quality childcare spaces available to families and to strengthen the childcare sector to champion these changes. The return on investment for communities is significant; not only will parents be able to return to work, but also the resilience of children will increase through quality early care and education, with the ultimate outcome being healthier, more productive citizens, and stronger social and economic sustainability.

Your consideration of our request is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

John Jack,
Chairperson

cc. local governments

Attachment - Alberni-Clayoquot Child Care Needs Assessment available upon request.
Reference: 351408

DEC 18 2019

Ken Gillis, Chair
Thompson–Nicola Regional District
and Co-Signers
300-465 Victoria Street
Kamloops BC V2C 2A9

Sent via email: admin@tnrd.ca

Dear Chair Gillis and Co-Signers:

Thank you for your letter of September 26, 2019, requesting the inclusion of packaging and paper products (PPP) from the industrial, commercial and institutional sector (ICI) in the Recycling Regulation (the regulation). I commend you for your collaboration with other local governments to provide a unified voice to the ministry.

I appreciate your support for British Columbia’s extended producer responsibility (EPR) framework. I have heard from many local governments, including several at the Union of B.C. Municipalities Conference, regarding the ICI sector experiencing the negative impacts of foreign import restrictions and constrained recycling markets.

B.C.’s EPR approach provides flexibility to industry, significantly reduces costs to all levels of government and achieves strong environmental and waste diversion outcomes. The system has also proven to be successful in difficult periods of low commodity value and limited markets. This model allows for economies of scale and province-wide consistency, more control over the quality of material collected and increased ability to process many types of material locally.

To clarify some of the concerns noted in your letter, Recycle BC members only pay fees for PPP supplied to residents and for the portion of PPP supplied to the ICI sector that may end up in the residential collection system (for example, the 15 percent of all take-out food packaging that may find its way into the household blue box). Furthermore, this EPR program has led to more PPP material on the open market, not less, with Recycle BC regularly tendering all commercial processing services.
As you are aware the Province recently held a consultation and engagement process for the CleanBC Plastics Action Plan. Over 35,000 British Columbians participated in the consultation process, sharing their opinions in an online survey and/or by providing a written submission. Ministry staff are currently developing a “What We Heard” report and working to determine the appropriate policy or regulatory responses, with the expectation to publish the report this winter.

Earlier this year, the ministry also undertook research and focused engagement concerning additional products that may prove suitable to manage under the regulation. This work will help inform the ministry on product or material gaps, including how recycling in the ICI sector is currently managed. Any work to explore regulatory amendments involving ICI materials would be accompanied by further consultation in advance of any such changes.

Thank you again for taking the time to write.

Sincerely,

George Heyman
Minister

cc: Kevin Acton, Chair, Regional District of North Okanagan
    Patrick Brabazon, Chair, qathet Regional District
    Rob Gay, Chair, Regional District of East Kootenay
    Philip Germuth, Chair, Regional District of Kitimat Stikine
    Gail Given, Chair, Regional District of Central Okanagan
    Andrew Hory, Chair, Regional District of Mountain Waddington
    Art Kaehn, Chair, Regional District of Fraser-Fort George
    Karla Kozakevich, Chair, Regional District of Okanagan Similkameen
    Rhona Martin, Chair, Columbia Shuswap Regional District
    Barry Pages, Chair, North Coast Regional District
    Tony Rainbow, Chair, Squamish-Lillooet Regional District
    Roly Russell, Chair, Regional District of Kootenay Boundary
    Gerry Thiessen, Chair, Regional District of Bulkley-Nechako
    Ian Thorpe, Chair, Regional District of Nanaimo
    Margo Wagner, Chair, Cariboo Regional District
    Aimee Watson, Chair, Regional District of Central Kootenay
    Bob Wells, Chair, Comox Valley Regional District
Hand Delivered

The Honourable George Heyman
Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy
PO Box 9047 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2

Dear Minister Heyman,

Subject: Request to include Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional (ICI) Recycling in the Recycling Regulation

Throughout North America, BC is recognized as a leader in Extender Producer Responsibility (EPR) programs. In particular, the addition of Packaging and Printed Paper (PPP) to the Recycling Regulation in 2014 has resulted in better access to recycling services province wide. Many small rural communities now have access to recycling, which was not economically viable prior to this change. We believe EPR programs set the framework for stable, long term end markets for recyclable material to be created here in British Columbia.

We are writing to request that the Recycling Regulation be amended to include PPP from the Industrial, Commercial, Institutional (ICI) sector. Presently there is a gap in service to many members of our communities. The ICI sector, including small businesses, schools, hospitals, municipal offices, care homes, and tourism resorts are often left with no viable option for recycling. Because PPP from the ICI sector is not included in the provincial EPR program, many of our regions have seen an increase in recyclable material ending up in landfills.

Furthermore, in many cases fees are paid into the Recycle BC program for products that are not accepted in the Recycle BC system, simply because of where the material is discarded. For example, a paper cup from a coffee shop can be recycled by a resident (either at depot or curbside), but the same paper cup can’t be recycled at a school, public library, or senior’s home. In our experience, trying to distinguish between ICI and residential PPP is challenging, frustrating, and arbitrary.

We recognize this challenge is heightened by the drastic changes in the global commodity market for recyclables. We also recognize that we are moving into a new reality where countries need to develop more capacity to process recyclable material locally, instead of shipping to overseas markets. As the current Recycle BC system controls a large portion of PPP in the province, there is little opportunity or incentive for competing commercial recycling companies to expand. In some cases, commercial recycling companies have reduced service because there is less material on the open market.
We feel that regulating ICI recycling will give industry more confidence to invest in technology to process materials within the province.

At present, most Regional District’s are in a dilemma. Do we step in to provide recycling services to the ICI sector at a significant cost to the tax payers, or do we allow recyclable materials to end up in our landfills? Each of the undersigned RD’s have unique characteristics and are responding to this challenge in different ways. However, we are united in our view that adding ICI PPP to the Recycling Regulation will accomplish the following:

- Improve the level of service to businesses and institutions in our communities;
- Create framework for processing recycling materials in BC;
- Remove the burden of handling ICI recycling from taxpayers; and
- Reduce recyclables going to landfill.

We, the undersigned, urge you to give serious consideration to adding ICI generated PPP into the Recycling Regulation, enabling appropriate collection and processing of these materials. We see this as a natural and crucial next step for EPR programs, showing that BC will continue to be a leader in waste reduction policy.

Thank you for your time and attention on this matter. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

THOMPSON-NICOLA REGIONAL DISTRICT

[Signature]

Kenneth Gillis, Chair

COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT

[Signature]

Rhona Martin, Chair

COMOX VALLEY REGIONAL DISTRICT

Bob Wells

[Signature]

Bob Wells, Chair

qathet REGIONAL DISTRICT

[Signature]

Patrick Brabazon, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF BULKLEY-NECHAKO

[Signature]

Gerry Thiessen, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

[Signature]

Aimee Watson, Chair
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL OKANAGAN

Gail Given, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF EAST KOOTENAY

Rob Gay, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF FRASER-FORT GEORGE

Art Kaehn, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF KITIMAT STIKINE

Philip Germuth, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF KOOTENAY BOUNDARY

Roly Russell, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF MOUNT WADDINGTON

Andrew Hory, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

Ian Thorpe, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH OKANAGAN

Kevin Acton, Chair

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF OKANAGAN SIMILKAMEEN

Karla Kozakevich, Chair

SQUAMISH-LILLOOET REGIONAL DISTRICT

Tony Rainbow, Chair

NORTH COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

Bárry Pages, Chair

CARIBOO REGIONAL DISTRICT

Margo Wagner, Chair
Financial Expenditure Report for December 2019

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cheques | Value     | % of Total |
------------------|-----------|------------|
1,085             | $3,122,451| 100%       |

Top 80% of payments by value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2,502,206</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>620,245</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $3,122,451 100%

For Details - See Page 2

Payments to Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 18,534 0.6%

For Details - See Page 3

Payments to Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>63,650</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discretionary and Community Development Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>3,040,267</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 3,103,917 99.4%

Total $3,122,451 100%

For Details - See Page 4

PAYROLL 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-19</td>
<td>1,007,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>956,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cheques | Value    | % of Total |
------------------|----------|------------|
1                  | $1,007,524| 100%       |

Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,860</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hourly/Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>956,863</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accounts Payable Top 60% of Payments for December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 60% of payments by value</th>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$2,020,296</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cheques:** 1,038  
**Total Value:** $652,245  
**% of Total:** 20%

**Remaining 20% of payments by Cheque:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$569,927</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The values are in USD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J.J. Enterprises/Pediatric</td>
<td>1,677.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Chieftain</td>
<td>1,431.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Alexander</td>
<td>502.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackman, Gary</td>
<td>328.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Jeff</td>
<td>139.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsonville Community Association</td>
<td>1,669.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, Tom</td>
<td>138.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall Tine (Lethbridge)</td>
<td>2,047.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle Building Maintenance</td>
<td>2,488.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle Building Supplies</td>
<td>353.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle Building Supplies</td>
<td>169.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle Home Hardware</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle Internet Security</td>
<td>90.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalle, Village of</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Gordon's Cleaning Services</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall Fry</td>
<td>718.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEM Services</td>
<td>5,976.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Equipment Ltd</td>
<td>121.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Enterprises</td>
<td>3,823.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Fire &amp; Safety Ltd</td>
<td>2,957.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Ford Sales Ltd</td>
<td>172.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Ford Sales Ltd</td>
<td>89.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Canada Cooperative</td>
<td>1,309.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Communications Ltd</td>
<td>710.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Glass &amp; Mirror Ltd</td>
<td>419.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Industrial Supply Ltd</td>
<td>1,257.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenlee Mountbatten Club - Grande</td>
<td>1,400.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kugler, Heather</td>
<td>119.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver, Ray</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval-Medical Canada Ltd</td>
<td>1,134.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahire, Ched</td>
<td>1,212.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramore, Cale</td>
<td>190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larose, Cindy</td>
<td>353.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC Enterprises</td>
<td>177.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefebvre, Ronald</td>
<td>1,057.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc Add Electronics</td>
<td>1,387.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech, Kello</td>
<td>75.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levison, Mentes</td>
<td>5,874.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin Electric Ltd</td>
<td>375.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidstone &amp; Company</td>
<td>2,285.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindenhouse Society</td>
<td>1,240.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little H Design Works</td>
<td>4,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liddell, David</td>
<td>741.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liedtke Property</td>
<td>1,067.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liedtke Property</td>
<td>2,020.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn, Jessica</td>
<td>249.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallon, Madison C P</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann, Lois</td>
<td>494.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mako Wholesale Ltd</td>
<td>921.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makin, David</td>
<td>207.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malt's Commercial</td>
<td>172.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mank, Kevin</td>
<td>963.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Smith, Paris</td>
<td>705.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marbeck Electrical Systems Ltd</td>
<td>919.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxe Environmental Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>1,249.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max, Karen</td>
<td>833.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxx Electric Ltd</td>
<td>244.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, Bruce</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick, Tammy</td>
<td>910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes, Ken</td>
<td>263.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McInnes, George</td>
<td>148.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Office Productivity</td>
<td>3,250.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller of Finance</td>
<td>7,983.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster Of Finance - Product Distribution Centre</td>
<td>888.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure</td>
<td>49.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Supply Ltd</td>
<td>221.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody, Fendt Ltd</td>
<td>2,762.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, Colin</td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Equipment Co-op</td>
<td>241.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munch, Deborah</td>
<td>183.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Veterinary Clinic Ltd</td>
<td>138.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neko, Village Of</td>
<td>7,185.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neko Auto Parts (Lethbridge)</td>
<td>21.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neko Auto Parts (Edmonton)</td>
<td>1,111.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekena Communications Limited</td>
<td>20.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson &amp; District Services Coordinating Society - Grants</td>
<td>1,008.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Building Centre Ltd</td>
<td>1,448.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Building Centre Ltd</td>
<td>532.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Farmers Supply Ltd</td>
<td>227.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Ford Sales (2003) Inc.</td>
<td>188.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, Barry</td>
<td>3,695.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Nordic Skib Club - Grants</td>
<td>770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Toyota</td>
<td>2,228.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, City</td>
<td>1,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson's Chocolatex</td>
<td>529.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexo, Kalle</td>
<td>156.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell, Thomas</td>
<td>874.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I.A. M.V. Recycling Service</td>
<td>649.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Audio Lab Ltd</td>
<td>1,078.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan Communications Ltd</td>
<td>5,840.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okotoks Fire Department Social Club - Grants</td>
<td>2,066.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oktiba Canada Corporation</td>
<td>2,081.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oka Negra</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsdahl, Neil</td>
<td>228.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaiwa Wholesaler Ukes Ltd</td>
<td>1,772.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace, Ederic</td>
<td>547.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panache, Hotel</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panache Laboratory Ltd</td>
<td>685.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, Greg</td>
<td>83.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck, Andrew</td>
<td>264.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFR Wholesale Fire &amp; Rescue Ltd</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney, Despen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney, Stephanie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiggins, Shirley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Environment &amp; Infrastructure Solutions,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Wyatt Inc</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP Canada Inc</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xilnet Communications Inc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Pages Group</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Volunteers Fire Social Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zayac, Daniel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalkai, Thomas M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone West Enterprises Ltd</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Accounts Payable for December 2019
## Breakdown by Type of Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cassiere, Adam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, Hans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidoff, Andrew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust, Ramona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196.68</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hevat, Suzan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>278.60</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Joseph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1195.22</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackman, Garry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>326.80</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood, Dione LD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>741.08</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn, Jessica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>249.40</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueh, Leah</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>494.92</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, Colin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>232.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novell, Thomas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>874.75</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Paul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>257.52</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popoff, Walter A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Ricky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tassone, Bruno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138.04</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toynton, Ronda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, Aimee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoleznak, Thomas M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170.52</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Number of Cheques</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bella, Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamie, Debra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.16</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berko, Alan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn, Douglas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackshaw, Nicky L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.96</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloodoff, Vanessa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>525.20</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewar, Joanna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177.45</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan, Raymond J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117.69</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durning, Stuart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquiveloff, Darren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ether, Steve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105.57</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraz, Carol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahan, Talia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.50</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner, Cody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>690.76</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235.48</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayfield, Alexandra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>445.25</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Alynne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Joel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167.04</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hann, Lynn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193.31</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt, Matthew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152.00</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, Avril</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarzen, John</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.20</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsley, Shelly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knudsen, Mandy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kugler, Heather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapelle, Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefebre, Chris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.60</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Cindy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>353.30</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeBlanc, Ronald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1677.44</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicham, Kelso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie, Madison C P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.90</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marr, Kevin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>803.47</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Smith, Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>708.60</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllister, Blaire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaux, Gordon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146.90</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munch, Deborah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103.90</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostafichuk, Neil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229.98</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, Greg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.80</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat, Andrea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>264.85</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereversoff, Charles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillay, Megan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polkina, Cathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Samantha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riccollon, Ryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa, Linsay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryter, Brooke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Amanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapevlov, Shannon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, Kunell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silkie, Brenda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudra, Sangita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>548.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Gissel, Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Micks, Duve Stacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vugteveen, Eddwa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayling, Tia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney, Stephanie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>346.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>Address 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABB Ltd.</td>
<td>123 Main St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Hughes</td>
<td>456 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>789 Pine Dr.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>101 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar</td>
<td>202 Maple Ln.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>303 Cedar Rd.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Beers</td>
<td>404 Birch Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Chemical</td>
<td>505 Willow Cir.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
<td>606 Chestnut Path</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>707 Walnut St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td>808 Oak St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>909 Pine Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliburton</td>
<td>100 Maple Ln.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeywell</td>
<td>202 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>303 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>404 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>505 Pine Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellogg</td>
<td>606 Maple Ln.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft</td>
<td>707 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenovo</td>
<td>808 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>909 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td>1000 Pine Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nissan</td>
<td>1100 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle</td>
<td>1200 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>1300 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>1400 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualcomm</td>
<td>1500 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota</td>
<td>1600 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>1700 Elm St.</td>
<td>City, State, ZIP</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This list is not exhaustive and is for demonstration purposes only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Company</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF Corporation</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHI Enterprise</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKL Manufacturing</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNO Retail</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQR Services</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Research</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPS Infrastructure</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Shares: 750
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consider multiple text and land use amendments to the Electoral Area K – The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 and Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 under a Block Amendment initiated by the Regional District.

If successful, the proposed Amendment Bylaws Nos. 2679 and 2680 would authorize the following amendments:

- Land use amendments to the Official Community Plan land use and zoning designations for 66 properties in 8 locations in Electoral Area K; and,
- Text amendments to both bylaws intended to: align policies and regulations with existing legislation, provide for easier interpretation and enforcement, and ensure consistency throughout the two bylaws. The proposed amendments are not proposed to change the intent of the existing bylaw.

The report summarizes comments received at the December 16, 2019 Public Hearing. Staff is recommending that the proposed amendments be given Third Reading.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

2.1 BACKGROUND CONTEXT

Since the adoption of the Electoral Area K Official Community Plan (OCP) and incorporation of Electoral Area K into RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675 in 2009, planning staff have catalogued requests for land use amendments from various property owners. The number of requests warranted a review of the OCP and Zoning Bylaw for Electoral Area K (refer to Table 1). Recent changes to other legislation and regulations affecting land use triggered the need to update the text of the bylaws. During the review process Planning, Building and Bylaw Enforcement staff were requested to list any other proposals for changes to the bylaws with the intent to clarify regulations for ease of interpretation and enforcement, and to ensure consistency in administration of the bylaws. The proposed text amendments are not proposed to change the intent of the existing bylaw.
**Table 1: Development Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Property Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Brausen</td>
<td>9274 Highway 6</td>
<td>Lot 1 Section 12 Township 69 Kootenay District Plan 14210 (PID 005-594-260)</td>
<td>10.3 acres /4.2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Jo-Ann Seaton</td>
<td>210 Browns Road</td>
<td>Lot 1 District Lot 398 Kootenay District Plan 9779 Except Plan NEP72569 (PID 010-641-645)</td>
<td>3.3 acres /1.3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert &amp; Susan Rogers</td>
<td>215 Browns Road</td>
<td>Lot A District Lot 398 Kootenay District Plan NEP72569 (PID 025-578-593)</td>
<td>2.7 acres /1.1 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel and Anne-Marie Paul</td>
<td>623 Nakusp East Road</td>
<td>Lot 10 District Lot 4274 Kootenay District Plan 1123 (PID 014-858-941)</td>
<td>9.8 acres /4.0 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakusp Greenscapes Ltd.</td>
<td>Alexander Road</td>
<td>Multiple (7) properties</td>
<td>267.5 acres /108.2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC Hydro</td>
<td>Hwy 6 - Burton Flats</td>
<td>Multiple (9) properties</td>
<td>164.6 acres /66.6 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development</td>
<td>Saddle Mountain Road &amp; Arrow Park Demars Road</td>
<td>Multiple (22) properties</td>
<td>573.0 acres /231.9 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development</td>
<td>Inonoaklin Valley Road</td>
<td>Multiple (24) properties</td>
<td>323.5 acres /130.9 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the October 16, 2019 Rural Affairs Committee the proposed amendments were introduced to the Committee as information for receipt and initial comment.

The proposal was first considered by the RDCK Board at its meeting held on November 21, 2019, where the following resolutions were made:
Resolution 829/19
That the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 is hereby given FIRST and SECOND reading by content and referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

Resolution 830/19
That the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given FIRST and SECOND reading by content and referred to a PUBLIC HEARING.

Resolution 831/19
That in accordance with Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015, Electoral Area K Director Paul Peterson is hereby delegated the authority to chair the Public Hearing on behalf of the Regional District Board.

A Public Hearing was held December 16, 2019 at the Nakusp Senior Citizen Hall. There were 13 members of the public in attendance. Questions from the public were concerning 623 Nakusp East Road – Paul and Alexander Road – Nakusp Greenscapes Ltd. Submissions were received regarding 623 Nakusp East Road – Paul: two letters and two public submissions. Community considerations are outlined below.

2.2 COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS

Concerns raised at the Public Hearing were regarding 623 Nakusp East Road – Paul. These concerns were similar to those raised during the initial referral period and included: nuisance smells, use of chemicals and impact to health and the environment, noise and aesthetic impacts, water usage, decreased property values, and security concerns.

The intent of enabling cannabis cultivation in the larger residential and agricultural zones of the RDCK was to re-direct such proposals to properties of sufficient size that siting and design considerations could address potential nuisance concerns by accommodating greater setbacks from adjacent property owners. This was also done in part to reduce the impact to the limited agricultural land base within the RDCK intended for food production and industrial land base intended for larger operations. The subject property is 4 hectares and meets the minimum parcel size requirements of 2 hectares for micro-cultivation under the proposed AG4K zoning.

The applicant proposes to apply to Health Canada for a Micro Cultivation License to facilitate an outdoor growing area 200 m² (2153 sq. ft) in size located south of the residence. The grow operations are proposed to be organic and would be seasonal from late May to mid September. No buildings would be constructed on site; the applicant plans to use a shipping container for the storage of product and will construct a barrier around the crop to meet Health Canada regulations. The applicant has indicated that off-site staff will only be present at planting and harvest times. The applicant would like to use trucking water to site as a water source for his operations.

The increase in traffic should be minimal due to off site staff only coming to site during planting and harvest times. Production is not proposed on site, which should generate less traffic. The product would have to be transported from site to elsewhere after harvesting.
A published report titled, ‘Commercial Cannabis Production in British Columbia: Best Available Control Technologies and Regulatory Oversight of Environmental Considerations’ funded by the Provincial and Federal Government cites qualitative information on the concentrations of terpenes and VOC’s (smells) emitted during the cultivation process as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Stage</th>
<th>Outdoor Cultivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock Plants and Propagation</td>
<td>Negligible - the odour cannot be detected by smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative Area</td>
<td>Negligible - the odour cannot be detected by smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetative Growth</td>
<td>Negligible - the odour cannot be detected by smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning to Flowering Growth</td>
<td>Low – faint smell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering Growth</td>
<td>Medium – odour is easily detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting, Drying and Trimming</td>
<td>High – strong smell that is unpleasant to most people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>Medium – odour is easily detected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the growing is proposed to be outdoors, the potential for smell must be mitigated by barriers and large setbacks. Due to the large lot sizes, the 200 m² (2153 sq. ft) cultivation area can be situated well away from existing homes, and existing treed areas can provide a buffer. The zoning requires structures to be at least 15 m (50 ft) from the property line. These measures should also aid to mitigate any visual impacts to neighbours.

Health Canada regulations address the chemicals that may be used on the cannabis crop, and security measures such as perimeter fencing and 24 hour security cameras.

Water
The Village of Nakusp has directed that they will not approve water from their connection for an agricultural use due to system capacity issues. The applicant has installed a water meter on October 23, 2019 to ensure no further Village water will be drawn beyond the permitted residential use. The applicant has indicated that they would like to truck necessary water for the growing operations from a source at Arrow Lakes utilizing a personal truck and a 2000 litre tank. Front Counter BC staff have indicated that this is a possibility and the applicant has applied for a new water license for the purposes of an industrial – greenhouse/nursery use. Staff recommend that the RDCK Board should consider withholding final adoption of the proposed amendments until a new water license application is approved by Front Counter BC to ensure there will be a legitimate alternative water source.

The exact amount of water it takes to grow cannabis depends on several factors such as the location of the operation, the size of the plants, and type of growing media. The applicant has indicated that by extrapolating from existing plants grown in the area, he estimates that local outdoor cannabis plants use 1 – 2 litres of water per cubic metre of plant canopy space per day - where the average local cannabis plant has a canopy of 1 m². The applicant calculates that 1.5 L per 1 m² of plant canopy space (accounting for rain fall lessening daily needs) multiplied by 200 plants equals 300 L per day or 70 grow
days equals 21,000 L annually. The applicant estimates he would use about 10 truck trips per growing season (approximately one trip per week). In the previous year there were 5 instances in the growing season where watering was required above and beyond rain fall.

**Recommendations**

Staff recommend two site specific amendments to the AG4K zone to decrease the potential for impacts to neighbours while supporting the applicant’s proposal. Staff recommend that the setbacks for the cultivation area be 30.0 m from the lot line of adjacent properties zoned residential. The zoning requires structures associated with cannabis be setback 15.0 m from the property line, but includes no setbacks for the outdoor growing area. Including the cultivation area and increasing setbacks could reduce the risk for smells to be of nuisance to neighbouring residences. As the growing is proposed to be outdoors, smell cannot be mitigated by HVAC systems or filters. Secondly, staff recommend to remove the ability for standard cultivation growing or processing on the property. Managing the potential scale of the operations will align the proposal with the rural residential character of the neighbourhood and best fit with the proposal to truck water to site.

**SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Included in Financial Plan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Bylaw Required:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Plan Amendment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Block Amendment is being undertaken by the RDCK to address unresolved requests following adoption of the Electoral Area K OCP No. 2022 and the incorporation of Electoral Area K into RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675 in 2009.

**b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):**

If the amending bylaws receive First Reading, the proposed land use amendments will be advertised in a locally circulating newspaper(s) and a Public Hearing will be held to allow for public comment on the proposed bylaw amendments in accordance with Section 464 of the Local Government Act.

**c. Environmental Considerations:**

Environmental goals of the Area K OCP are:

1. Protect the natural environment.
2. Work toward carbon neutrality by focusing on alternative methods of transportation and energy efficiency.
3. Ensure efficient transportation systems including the promotion of pedestrian and non-vehicular traffic.
4. Direct development away from areas of high natural hazards to areas of no or low natural hazards, unless appropriate mitigation works are in place.
5. Ensure that development does not adversely harm or detract from identified wildlife corridors and areas with high wildlife and fisheries habitat value.
6. Protect the quantity and quality of water resources and waterways.

**d. Social Considerations:**

Social goals of the Area K OCP are:
1. Provide for safe, quiet, and attractive rural residential neighbourhoods that will satisfy the housing and social needs of all Arrow Lakes residents, with particular emphasis on affordable market, rental and seniors housing.
2. Protect and enhance the unique “community character” of the unincorporated settlements within the rural plan area.
3. Protect and enhance public access along the foreshore of the Arrow Lakes

e. Economic Considerations:

Economic goals of the Area K OCP are:
1. Ensure that home-based business opportunities are provided, with recognition of impacts to neighbours, local business and residential character.
2. Promote and enhance local food production through protection of viable agricultural lands and educational and marketing support to local producers.

f. Communication Considerations:

A Public Hearing was held on October 8, 2019 as per Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015.

g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:

Planning Department staff follows the ‘Land Use Amendment Procedure’ identified in Schedule ‘D’ of the Regional District of Central Kootenay Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015.

h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:

This application falls under the operational role of Planning Services.

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

SUMMARY

Staff have brought forward these proposed text and land use amendments to the Electoral Area K – The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 and Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 under a Block Amendment for the Rural Affairs Committee consideration of whether to recommend first and second reading to the Board. The intent of these proposed amendments is to consider:

- Land use amendments to the Official Community Plan land use and zoning designations for 66 properties in 8 locations in Electoral Area K; and,
- Text amendments to both bylaws intended to: align policies and regulations with existing legislation, provide for easier interpretation and enforcement, and ensure consistency throughout the two bylaws. The proposed amendments are not proposed to change the intent of the existing bylaw.

No concerns were voiced during the public hearing regarding the proposed amendments except for comments received regarding one of the properties 623 Nakusp East Road – Paul. Staff believe the large lot size and requirement to meet Health Canada's regulations for licensing will aid to mitigate most of the neighbour's identified concerns. Staff have recommended increased setbacks from residential zoned properties and disallowing standard level cannabis licensing to further mitigate potential negative impact to adjacent property owners.
Staff recommend third reading of the amending bylaws and that the RDCK Board consider withholding final adoption of the proposed amendments until a new water license application is approved by Front Counter BC to address concerns about water.

OPTIONS

Option 1: Proceed with Third Reading
1. THAT the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 is hereby given THIRD reading by content.

2. THAT the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading by content.

THAT ADOPTION of RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 be withheld until such a time a new water license application from Front Counter BC for the purposes of Industrial sub-purpose – Greenhouse/Nursery for Lot 10 District Lot 4274 Kootenay District Plan 1:23 (PID 014-858-941) has been obtained.

Option 2: No Further Action
1. THAT no further action be taken with respect to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009.

2. THAT no further action be taken with respect to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004.

Option 3: Defer the Decision
1. THAT further consideration of the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 BE REFERRED to a future meeting of the Rural Affairs Committee.

2. THAT further consideration of the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 BE REFERRED to a future meeting of the Rural Affairs Committee.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATIONS
1. THAT the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 is hereby given THIRD reading by content.

2. THAT the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 being a bylaw to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby given THIRD reading by content.
THAT ADOPTION of RDCK Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2680, 2019 be withheld until such a time a new water license application from Front Counter BC for the purposes of Industrial sub-purpose – Greenhouse/Nursery for Lot 10 District Lot 4274 Kootenay District Plan 1123 (PID 014-858-941) has been obtained.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Hawkins, MCIP, RPP
Planner 2

CONCURRENCE

Planning Manager
General Manager of Development Services
Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Bylaw Nos. 2679 and 2680 Public Hearing Minutes
Attachment B – Amending Bylaws 2679 and 2680
A Public Hearing for Bylaw Nos. 2679 & 2680, a proposed amendment to Electoral Area K – The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 and Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 was held on December 16, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at Nakusp Senior Citizen Hall, 210 – 8th Avenue NW, Nakusp, BC. The Hearing commenced at 6:00 p.m. There were 13 members of the public in attendance.

**PRESENT**

Paul Peterson, Chair of Public Hearing  
Dana Hawkins, Planner  
Mikaela Wheaton, Public Hearing Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER**

Director Peterson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**INTRODUCTIONS – 6:00 pm**

Director Peterson introduced himself and the RDCK staff to the public.

**OVERVIEW OF PROPOSAL – 6:05 pm**

Dana Hawkins gave an overview of the proposal.

**PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT**

The applicants did not make a presentation.

**QUESTIONS and ANSWERS – 6:21 pm**

The public asked questions which were answered by the Chair and Dana Hawkins.

Questions and concerns are summarized as follows for 623 Nakusp East Road:

| Q: Isn’t Micro-Cultivation of Cannabis allowed in Rural Residential areas?  
| A: It is allowed in the R3K zone as an accessory use, but this property is R2K which does not allow it.  
| Q: With the proposed AG4K zoning is there still a maximum of 200 m²?  
| A: The Agriculture 4K has a couple cannabis uses permitted. What we’ve done is matched out terminology with the different types of licenses through Health Canada. The applicant is proposing a Micro Cultivation license, but what’s permitted under the AG4K zone is Micro Cultivation, Micro |
Processing, Nursery, Standard Cultivation and Standard Processing. It is the Micro Cultivation license that under Health Canada has a maximum of 200 m².

Q: So if this property got changed, it would permit all of those uses and the applicant could have an area larger than the 200 m²?
A: Correct.

Questions and concerns are summarized as follows for Alexander Road:

Q: It was proposed on Lot 1 that part of the zoning be Open Space because of the bat habitat. Since there is no building on the property which bats are typically attracted to, how was the size of that area determined?
A: The lot currently has a little square where a hill is that is zoned Open Space. We didn’t change that boundary. We did expand the R3K zoning at the back of the property where it was split zoned to align with the property line so that it didn’t limit the building area. Since we couldn’t find any record of the bat habitat, we just talked to the community, we left the area the same and didn’t change those dimensions.

FORMAL SUBMISSIONS FOR OR AGAINST PROPOSED BYLAW Nos. 2679 & 2680

Written Formal Submissions regarding 623 Nakusp East Road received prior to the Public Hearing are attached and form part of these minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date of Receipt</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric and Joan Williams</td>
<td>675 Nakusp East Road</td>
<td>December 9, 2019</td>
<td>See attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakusp, BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelie van Dam</td>
<td>590 Nakusp East Road</td>
<td>December 12, 2019</td>
<td>See attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nakusp, BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERBAL formal submissions received during the Public Hearing:

Nicolene Reitmeier, 603 Nakusp East Road – concerns about 623 Nakusp East Road

We're the property west of this one. Just, it was the smell, which was stated in the two previous letters, as being the issue during the harvest time. And the size of the area permitted is a bit of a concern. That's a large area.

Paul Reitmeier, 603 Nakusp East Road – concerns about 623 Nakusp East Road

Odour is our only concern, with us being directly below. I've been visiting my neighbours, and they've reassured me, but it is still a concern.

ADJOURNMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING

The hearing was adjourned at 6:33 p.m.
Dana Hawkins, MCIP, RPP  
Planner  
dhawkins@rdck.bc.ca  

Re: PUBLIC HEARING Z1902K  

Thank you for your letter of November 28, 2019 advising of the upcoming public hearing relative to proposed amendments to Official Community Plan No. 2022 and the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675.

We would ask that our previous letter of 10 June 2019 be submitted for consideration at the Public Hearing, as well as today’s letter as we are unable to attend in person.

Further to our letter of 10 June 2019, and having read the information therein, we wish to reiterate our earlier opposition and again stipulate our standing against this proposal.

Of concern, is the graph outlining the stages of growth and the odour’s associated with those stages. Of particular concern, is that the highest level of odour, which is associated with the Flowering Growth stage, the Harvesting, Drying and Trimming stage, and the Packaging Stages, are all in the warm months of May to September. This is precisely the time of year that the odours will be most offensive as this coincides with the time of year that property owners are outside, on their decks, in their yards and on their properties. We feel this will cause definite loss of enjoyment of these warmer months.

Again, as stated in our previous letter, the use of chemicals in the area are of concern as those chemicals will be dispersed into the air and saturate the ground, thereby contaminating the surrounding soils and runoff. Perhaps an environmental impact study is warranted. Our assertion is that this type of business would be better suited to an industrial area, not an agricultural area.

We are concerned as well, about the obvious impact this type of industrial business will have on the property values of this pristine agricultural area.

Also of concern is your statement that “Staff are supportive of this proposal” ....we find that rather disconcerting considering that the public hearing has not taken place and it is we, the residents of the area in question, who will be most impacted by this proposal.

Thank you for submitting this letter and our earlier letter of 10 June 2019 for consideration at the Public Hearing.

Sincerely,  
Eric and Joan Williams
We are writing this letter in strong opposition to the application for a zoning change, for the property noted as Block 10, DL 4274, Kootenay Land District Plan NEP 1123. The application for zoning change of this property from Country Residential (R2K) to Agriculture 4K (AG4K), is inappropriate for the following reasons:

1) The current zoning of R2 residential allows the properties in this area to maintain a high degree of privacy, tranquility and aesthetic value. Changing the zoning to allow industrial use will negatively impact all these things. We strongly feel that the property values in the area will be negatively and severely impacted. While cannabis production may be considered agricultural in nature, it still involves an industrial process, to produce, process and distribute.

2) We feel as well, that there is insufficient water supply for the area in the event of fire; which would be at a heightened risk due to the fact that a cannabis growing facility would require copious amounts of water, just to function, not to mention how much would be required should a fire break out.

3) Cannabis growing facilities are loud. They are also a 24 hour a day operation. Thus impacting the quality of life for residents in the surrounding area. The large fans and generators required to run such a facility create an undue amount of noise pollution, not appropriate for a residential area.

4) Cannabis growing facilities are odorous. As crops grow, mature and are harvested, the smell that emanates from these facilities are very strong and irritating. The residences in the vicinity would be severely impacted by these smells.

5) Cannabis growing facilities use large amounts of dangerous chemicals, that have the ability and probability to be released into the air, ground and waste water system (sewer).

6) Other municipalities are opting for cannabis growing facilities to be restricted to industrially zoned areas; and Nakusp should be following their lead and enforcing the same requirement.

In closing, we would request that this application be denied on the basis of the above points and that the "country residential" designation of our pristine country lifestyle properties in the surrounding area be preserved. This letter was written without benefit of legal counsel, we do however, reserve the right to seek same.

Sincerely,

Eric Williams
Joan Williams
Regional District of Central Kootenay December 12, 2019
Nelson BC
Attn.: Dana Hawkins

This is my second letter to oppose the rezoning of 623 Nakusp East Road, Nakusp BC.

I still believe that a cannabis cultivation business belongs in an commercial/industrial area and not in a residential area for the following reasons:

*Health risks when breathing in all the chemicals. The air will be contaminated. What kind of chemicals will be used. Are there studies done what it does to our health and the environment?

*The smell, especially when it is harvest time mid summer. We live in a very nice, quiet area. We enjoy being outside and breath in the fresh, very healthy air. Our concern is that we cannot enjoy this anymore in the future. Will there be odour controlled technology?

* Ground pollution. What does it do to the environment.

*A big concern is the increased water supply. There is not enough water supply in Nakusp and definitely not enough on the Nakusp East Road. We rely on a pump down the hill. Use of city water will decrease the water supply for us. Cannabis plants need a lot of water. They need 21 liters per plant per day. Where do they get the water from.

*Our properties will go down in value.

*The plant surface for micro cannabis cultivation must not exceed 200 M2 what is 0.0494 acre. The Paul's are talking about 4 acres, that is illegal.

*The potential of illegal sale is very high.

* More traffic.

*What kind of security do they have, Do we have to feel unsafe now where we live?

* It is illegal for micro-cultivators to sell their products to consumers. They can only sell their products to businesses licensed to sell marijuana to consumers.

* How will everything be maintained.

* Who will be checking if the regulations are followed.
I am not against opening a new business but it should be in an industrial area and not in a residential area.

Thank you for considering our concern.

Sincerely,

Roelie van Dam,
590 Nakusp East Road
Nakusp, BC
Regional District of Central Kootenay

Bylaw No. 2679

A Bylaw to amend Electoral Area ‘K’ — The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to amend the Electoral Area ‘K’ — The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009, and amendments thereto.

NOW THEREFORE the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay, in open meeting assembled, HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

APPLICATION

1. That Schedule ‘A’ of Electoral Area ‘K’ — The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 be amended by:

A) Official Community Plan Map Designations by adding the following under ‘Rural Designations’:
Quarry (Q)

B) Part 7 by replacing Community Residential Policies 2. With the following:
2. Supports the development of medium density residential with lot sizes under 1.0 ha (2.47 acres) in or adjacent to existing communities.

C) Part 8 by replacing industrial (M) Policies 4. with the following:
4. Supports that Industrial Development Permits pursuant to Section 488.1(1) (a) and (f) of the Local Government Act may be considered on any parcel designated as Industrial. Such permits may be subject to the provision of performance bonds and/or registered covenants ensuring compliance of the permit.

D) Part 8 by replacing Industrial (M) Policies 6. with the following:
6. Supports that a Development Permit Area pursuant to Sections 488.1 and 489 of the Local Government Act shall be required for all industrial developments to ensure development is compatible with adjacent land uses.

E) Part 12 by replacing Natural Environment Policies 2.b. with the following:

F) Part 12 by replacing Natural Environment Policies 3. with the following:
3. Supports the Provincial requirement that developers apply for and obtain appropriate permits and authorization for “Changes In and About a Stream” pursuant to Section 11 of the Water Sustainability Act.
G) Part 13 by replacing Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets - Background with the following:

Beginning in 2007, the Province of BC has moved forward with a number of legislated and policy actions designed to encourage energy efficiency and reduce emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). These are driven by a legislated target to reduce the total GHG emissions in the Province by 33% from 2007 levels by 2020, and 80% by 2050.1

Of specific relevance to local governments is the Local Government (Green Communities) Statutes Amendment Act (Bill 27, 2008). “Bill 27” amends the Local Government Act to read:

- LGA 473 (3) - An official community plan must include targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the area covered by the plan, and policies and actions of the local government proposed with respect to achieving those targets (by May 31, 2010).
- LGA 429 - Required Content of a Regional Growth Strategy: (2)(d) to the extent that these are regional matters, targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the RDCK, and policies and actions of the local government proposed for the RDCK with respect to achieving those targets (by May 31, 2011).

In addition, Bill 27 provides some additional enabling powers to local governments intended to assist them in achieving reductions of community-wide emissions. This context provides a mandate to communities and regions to explore energy as part of the planning process.

H) Part 14 by replacing Hazard Land Policies 3. with the following:

3. The Regional Board encourages the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development to impose the strictest regulation of logging of Crown lands in all community and domestic watersheds.

I) Part 17 by replacing 17.0 Temporary Commercial and Industrial Permits with the following:

17.0 TEMPORARY USE PERMITS

Background

Temporary Use Permits may be issued by the RDCK under the Local Government Act, s.493. The temporary use may continue in accordance with the provisions of the permit until the date that the permit expires, or three years after the permit was issued, whichever occurs first. Permits may be renewed only once, after which the use must be either permanently designated in the CCP Bylaw and Zoning Bylaw or cease. Temporary Use Permits are not a substitute for a land use designation amendment in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw. Permits are also subject to approval by the Agricultural Land Commission where land is within the Agriculture Land Reserve.

Objective

1. Permit temporary uses to provide short-term opportunity when considered appropriate by the Regional Board, while minimizing any negative impacts affecting surrounding properties or the environment.

Policies

The Regional Board:

1. May consider the issuance of Temporary Use Permits throughout the Electoral Area K plan area, subject to the following:
a. demonstration that the use is temporary or seasonal in nature;
b. address potential conflict with nearby land uses;
c. address potential impacts on environmentally sensitive areas;
d. satisfy provision of adequate servicing that meets health requirements; and,
e. consider relevant policies within other sections of this plan.

2. May require conditions under which a temporary use may be allowed, including: the buildings or structures that may be used; the period of applicability of the permit; the area, duration or timing of use; and required site rehabilitation upon cessation of the use.

3. May require security deposits, site restoration plans or letters of undertaking to ensure conditions are met.

J) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #1: Environmentally Sensitive Residential Cluster Development Area - Category with the following:
The ESRC DP area is designated under Section 488.1(1) (a) and (e) of the Local Government Act for the establishment of objectives for the form and character of intensive residential development.

K) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #1: Environmentally Sensitive Residential Cluster Development Area - Area with the following:
The ESRC DP area is comprised of all privately owned or leased lands designated as Community Residential (R1), Country Residential (R2) and Rural Residential (R3) on Schedule ‘B’ where a strata development, fee simple lots, shared interest, cooperatives, or companies are proposed that result in five or more sub-lots or lots that are less than 1 hectare (2.47 acres) in area or a building strata or residential development that is comprised of five or more buildings or dwelling units.

L) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #1: Environmentally Sensitive Residential Cluster Development Area - Determining whether development falls within the ESRC DP Area with the following:
A development permit shall be required for all subdivisions that result in five or more strata sub-lots or fee simple lots that are less than 1 hectare (2.47 acres) in area, or any building strata or residential development that is comprised of five or more buildings or dwelling units.

M) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #1: Environmentally Sensitive Residential Cluster Development Area - Exemptions with the following:
Lands that are not subject to a strata development, fee simple lots, shared interest, cooperatives, or companies that propose lots or sub-lots that are greater than 1 hectare (2.47 acres) in area, propose the creation of less than five sub-lots or lots, or involve the construction of less than five buildings or dwelling units in a building strata or residential development.

N) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #2: Industrial Development Permit (IDP) Area - Category with the following:
The IDP area is designated under Section 488.1(1) (a) and (f) of the Local Government Act for the establishment of objectives for the protection of the natural environment and form and character of industrial uses within the Plan area.
O) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #3: Resort Commercial Development Permit (RCDP) Area - Category with the following:
All lands designated Tourist Commercial (C2) as shown in Schedule B, are designated as a Development Permit Areas pursuant to Section 488(1)(f) of the Local Government Act, for the purpose of providing guidelines for the form and character of commercial and multi-family uses.

P) Part 19 by adding the following as Development Permit Area #3: Resort Commercial Development Permit (RCDP) Area – Exemptions 2.:
2. Subdivisions.

Q) Part 19 by replacing Development Permit Area #4 – Small Scale Food Processing Development Permit - Category with the following:
All small scale food processing facilities that process more than 50% of off farm product within Agricultural Designations as shown on Schedule ‘B’ of the Area K – The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 require a Development Permit pursuant to Sections 488.1(1)(b), and (c) of the Local Government Act, for the purpose of providing guidelines for the protection of development from hazardous conditions and protection of farming.

R) By making such consequential changes as are required to reflect the foregoing amendments, including without limitation changes in the numbering and Table of Contents of the bylaw.

2 That Schedule ‘B’ of Electoral Area ‘K’ – The Arrow Lakes Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2022, 2009 be amended by:

A) changing the Future Land Use Designation of Lot, 1 Section 12, Township 69, Kootenay District, Plan 14210 (PID 005-594-260) from General Commercial (C1) to Rural Residential (R3), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

B) changing the Future Land Use Designation of Lot 1, District Lot 398, Kootenay District, Plan 9779 Except Plan NEP72569 (PID 010-641-645) from Industrial (I) and Country Residential (R2) to Country Residential (R2), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

C) changing the Future Land Use Designation of Lot A, District Lot 398, Kootenay District, Plan NEP72569 (PID 025-578-693) from Industrial (I) to Country Residential (R2), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

D) changing the Future Land Use Designation of Lot 10, District Lot 4274, Kootenay District, Plan 1123 (PID 014-858-941) from Country Residential (R2) to Agriculture (AG), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

E) changing the Future Land Use Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) and Rural Residential (R3) to Open Space (OS) and Rural Residential (R3), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   i. Lot 1, DL 7896, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-521)
   ii. Lot 5, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247(PID 028-740-564)
iii. Lot 6, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-572)
iv. Lot 7, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-581)
v. District Lot 9152, Kootenay District, Except Plans NEP23532 & EPP13247 (PID 014-028-085)
vi. District Lot 9149, Kootenay District, Managed Forest No 105, NTS: 424-110 (PID 014-028-051)
vii. District Lot 7896, Kootenay District, Except Plan 5875 & 17277, Managed Forest No 105, NTS: 424-110 (PID 005-543-894)

F) Changing the Future Land Use Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) and Environmental Reserve (ER) to Environmental Reserve (ER), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   i. Lot 1, District Lot 1784 Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-686-752)
   ii. Lot 2, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-651-525)
   iii. Lot 3, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-651-533)
   iv. Lot 4, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-685-837)
   v. Lot 5 District Lot 1784 Kootenay District Plan 1629 (PID: 015-651-541)
   vii. Lot 1, District Lot 1785, Kootenay District, Plan 1338 Except That Part of the Said Lot Lying West of a Line Parallel to and 440 Feet Distant from the Westerly Boundary Thereof (PID 015-686-087)
   viii. Lot 2, District Lot 1785, Kootenay District, Plan 1338 (PID 015-867-811)
   ix. Lot 1, District Lot 6549, Kootenay District, Plan 853 Except Plan 8798 (PID 028-573-137)

G) Changing the Future Land Use Designation of the following lots from Agriculture (AG) and Open Space (OS) to Environmental Reserve (ER) as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   i. Lot 13, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 919 (PID 013-127-837)
   ii. Lot 1, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 919 (PID 013-127-829)
   iii. Lot 7B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 016-065-743)
   iv. Lot 9B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 013-127-012)
   v. Lot 8B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 013-126-997)
   vi. District Lot 8566, Kootenay District, Except the Westerly 35 Chains (PID 013-123-751)
   vii. Lot 13, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-531)
   viii. Lot 11, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Part Included in Ref. Plan 403671 (PID 012-489-786)
   ix. Block 10, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-417)
   x. Lot 9, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-450)
   xi. That Part of Lot 11 Included in Ref. Plan 403671, District Lot 8563 , Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-913)
   xii. Lot 17, District Lot 8563 and 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Part in Plan NEP271711 (PID 012-489-221)
   xiii. Block 18, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-772-331)
xiv. Block 20, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-784-118)
xv. Block 21, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-784-134)
xvi. Block 19, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-772-349)
xvii. West ½ of Block 22, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-793-010)
xviii. East ½ of Block 22, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-771-920)
ix. Parcel B of Lot 23 of District Lot 8564, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482
   Except Plan 142001 (PID 015-771-997)
xx. District Lot 8565, Kootenay District (PID 012-490-636)
xxi. Parcel A of Lot 23 of District Lot 8564, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482
    Except Plan 142001 (PID 013-128-591)
xxii. Block 24, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-771-806)

H) changing the Future Land Use Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) to
   Environmental Reserve (ER), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   i. Block 48, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 915 Ex. Parcel A (See 1560561) (PID
      013-127-098)
   ii. Block 47, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 915 (PID 013-127-063)
   iii. Lot 110, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-110)
   iv. Lot 111, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-128)
   v. Lot 112, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-161)
   vi. Lot 113, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-187)
   vii. Lot 114, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-209)
   viii. Lot 115, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-217)
   ix. Lot 121, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-365)
   x. Lot 116, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-241)
   xi. Lot 120, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-322)
   xii. Lot 117, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-268)
   xiii. Lot 119, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-314)
   xiv. Block 45, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 1005 Ex. Parcels A and B (Ref. Plan
      846171) (PID 013-127-888)
   xv. Lot 118, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-292)
   xvi. Parcel B (Ref. Plan 846171) of Block 45, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 1005
      (PID 013-127-918)
   xvii. Block 1, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-060)
   xviii. Block 2, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-132)
   xix. Parcel A (see 1560561) of Block 48, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 915 (PID
      013-127-071)
   xx. Block 3, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-159)
   xxi. Block 4, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-183)
   xxii. Block 5, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-221)
   xxiii. Block 6, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-281)
   xxiv. Block 7, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-302)

3 This Bylaw shall come into force and effect upon its adoption.

CITATION

4 This Bylaw may be cited as “Regional District of Central Kootenay Bylaw No. 2679, 2019.”
READ A FIRST TIME this 21st day of November, 2019.

READ A SECOND TIME this 21st day of November, 2019.

WHEREAS A PUBLIC HEARING was held this 16th day of December, 2019.

READ A THIRD TIME this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

ADOPTED this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

__________________________________________
Aimee Watson, Board Chair

__________________________________________
Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer
From: General Commercial (C1)
To: Rural Residential (R3)

Lot 1 Section 12 Township 69 Kootenay District Plan 14210 (PID 005-594-260)
From: Industrial (M)  
To: Country Residential (R2)  

Lot 1 District Lot 398 Kootenay District  
Plan 9779 Except Plan NEP72569 (PID 010-641-645)
Schedule 'A' of Amendment Bylaw No. 2679, 2019
Z1902K-BLOCK-RDCK-BA000026
Owner: Rogers

Schedule 'B'
OCP Designation

From: Industrial (M)
To: Country Residential (R2)
Lot A District Lot 398 Kootenay District Plan NEP72569 (PID 025-578-693)
From: Agriculture (AG)  
To: Environmental Reserve (ER)  

Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Bylaw No. 2680

A Bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004, and amendments thereto.

NOW THEREFORE the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay, in open meeting assembled, HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

APPLICATION

1 That the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be amended as follows:

A) Division 2 Application by replacing Section 202 with the following:

The attached schedules form part of this Bylaw and constitute the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 pursuant to Part 14 of the Local Government Act of British Columbia.

B) Division 4 Authority and Requirements of the Legislation by replacing Section 400 with the following:

1. Section 479 of the Local Government Act lists the elements that may be addressed in a zoning bylaw.
2. Section 525 of the Local Government Act allows the Regional District to require owners or occupiers of land, buildings or structures to provide off-street parking and loading spaces.
3. Section 526 of the Local Government Act allows the Regional District to regulate the number, size, type, form, appearance and location of any signs.
4. Section 527 of the Local Government Act allows the Regional District Board to set standards for and to regulate the provision of screening and landscaping to mask and separate uses.
5. Section 514 (4) of the Local Government Act allows the Regional District to establish the minimum parcel size to allow subdivision to provide a residence for a relative.

C) Division 4 Authority and Requirements of the Legislation by replacing Section 404. 4. with the following:

Penalties are subject to the conditions of any applicable RDCK Municipal Ticketing Information Bylaw and RDCK Bylaw Enforcement Notice and Dispute Adjudication System Bylaw as amended or replaced from time to time.

D) Division 4 Authority and Requirements of the Legislation by replacing Section 407 with the following:

1. An appeal for a minor variance may be available to the Board of Variance in accordance with Section 540 of the Local Government Act.
2. A Development Variance permit may be issued by the Board subject to Section 498 of the Local Government Act.

E) Division 5 Interpretation by replacing existing definitions with the following:

ACCESSORY BUILDING OR STRUCTURE means a detached building or structure located on the same parcel as the principal building, the use of which is subordinate, customarily incidental, and exclusively devoted to that of the principal building. Accessory buildings or structures may not contain a dwelling unit;

CARRIAGE HOUSE means a secondary and self contained dwelling unit located within a building used or intended to be used as a residence for one (1) family where the dwelling unit is built over an existing garage or car-port and is either purpose built or a conversion of an existing building;

F) Division 5 Interpretation by adding the following definitions in the appropriate alphabetical order:

HOME BASED BUSINESS means any home craft, professional practice, or other means of livelihood which is carried on within a dwelling unit or accessory building or structure by a permanent resident of the dwelling unit;

HOTEL means a building or buildings containing housekeeping and/or sleeping units each with separate entrances from a common hallway and designed to provide temporary accommodation for the travelling public;

PUB means development holding a Liquor Primary License where food and alcoholic beverages are offered for sale to the public, for consumption within the premises or off the site;

RESTAURANT means a permanent and fixed premises in which food is prepared, cooked and served to the public in exchange for money for service or to which the public have access for the purpose of purchasing prepared food for human consumption on the premises. These establishments may be holders of a Food Primary License;

SHORT TERM RENTAL means the use of a dwelling unit to provide tourist accommodation;

WAREHOUSING means the use or intended use of land, buildings or structures for the purpose of receiving and storage of goods for compensation, and includes the storage of goods by a distributor or supplier who markets goods for retail sale at other locations, but excludes retail sales from the site;

WAREHOUSES, MINI means a building consisting of completely enclosed, individually controlled compartments available for public rent used for the storage of products, goods, personal articles and vehicles. External storage of boats, trailers and recreational vehicles is permitted if area is landscaped and screened;

G) Division 5 Interpretation by deleting the following definitions:

REGIONAL BOARD means the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay;

H) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 600 with the following:
Non-conforming uses and siting shall comply with all applicable requirements of Section 528 of the Local Government Act.

I) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 602. 2. with the following:
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided under Section 514 of the Local Government Act shall be the minimum site area of the zone in which the parcel is located unless otherwise stated.

J) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 603. 5. c. with the following:
where the remainder of the lot is consolidated with an adjacent property that has an agricultural tax assessment from the British Columbia Assessment Authority or is within the ALR or created under Section 514 of the Local Government Act.

K) Division 6 General Regulations by deleting Section 603. 5. d.

L) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 605. 1. with the following:
Unless otherwise stated, no principal or accessory building or structure except a fence may be located within 7.5 metres of a front or exterior side lot line or within 2.5 metres of any other lot line.

M) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 605. 5. with the following:
Despite Section 605(1), for all of Electoral Area F, unless otherwise stated in the zone, no principal or accessory building or structure except a fence may be located within 4.5 metres of a front or exterior side lot line or within 2.5 metres of any other lot line.

N) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607. 3. with the following:
The site area devoted to the Home Based Business, inclusive of external storage of materials, equipment or finished products, shall not exceed 100 square metres on any R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, MFR-F, HR-I, C5 and AG zoned lot;

O) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607. 4. with the following:
The site area devoted to the Home Based Business, inclusive of external storage of materials, equipment or finished products, shall not exceed 200 square metres on any R4 zoned lot;

P) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607. 5. with the following:
No more than two (2) persons who are not a resident of the dwelling may be employed in the Home Based Business in on any R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, MFR-F, HR-I, C5 and AG zoned lot.

Q) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607. 7. with the following:
No change is made in the external appearance of the building which would indicate that a Home Based Business is being conducted therein; except for one unilluminated sign not exceeding:
a. 0.4 square metre on a lot in the R1, MFR-F, R6 and R7 zones; or
b. 1.0 square metre on any R2, R3, R4, C5, HR-I and AG zoned lot

R) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607. 11. with the following:
The maximum number of vehicles permitted for repair on any lot at any one time shall be limited to:
a. two (2) for lots zoned R1, R2, R6, R7, MFR-F, HR-I, C5; and
b. six (6) on any R3, R4, and AG zoned lot

S) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 607.12. with the following:
Home Based Businesses that include the caring of eight or less individuals at any one time as per the Community Care and Assisted Living Act shall be permitted.

T) Division 6 General Regulations by adding Section 607.12B. as follows:
Overnight accommodation shall not be permitted as a Home Based Business other than the care of six individuals or less as per the Community Care and Assisted Living Act.

U) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 608. 2. with the following:
No more than two (2) persons who are not a resident of the premises may be employed in the tourist accommodation operation;

V) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 608. 3. with the following:
No change is made in the external appearance of the building, which indicates an Accessory Tourist operation is being conducted on the premises, except for one un-illuminated sign not larger than:
\[a. \quad 0.4 \text{ square metre on a lot zoned R1, R6, R7 or MFR-F, and} \]
\[b. \quad 1.0 \text{ square metre on any R2, R3, R4, CS, HR-I or AG zoned lot.} \]

W) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 608. 5. with the following:
No more than three (3) sleeping rooms with a maximum of eight (8) lodgers may be used for the bed and breakfast accessory tourist accommodation in a dwelling in any R1, R2, R3, R6, R7, HR-I, MFR-F and AG zoned lot;

X) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 608. 8. with the following:
Accessory tourist accommodation camping operations shall not be permitted on any lots zoned R1, R2, R6, R7, MFR-F or HR-I;

Y) Division 6 General Regulations by adding the following as Section 610B:
\[\text{Recreational Vehicles}\]
610B
1. A recreational vehicle may be parked or stored on a property to a maximum of two (2) vehicles.

2. A recreational vehicle may only be used as temporary living or sleeping quarters as per Accessory Tourist Accommodation, Temporary Guest Accommodation and Campground regulations, but can not be connected to services associated with the principal or an accessory dwelling.

3. Notwithstanding 610B(2) a recreational vehicle may be used to provide temporary accommodation on a property during construction of a principal or accessory dwelling on a lot, provided that:
   a. a building permit has been issued for the principal or accessory dwelling and the dwelling is under construction; and
   b. the occupancy of the recreational vehicle shall not continue beyond commencement of occupancy of the permanent dwelling.
Z) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 611 'Application of Regulations' with the following:
The Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure standards for required parking spaces will apply when dealing with matters that are within its jurisdiction, such as highway access permits.

Regional District standards will apply with respect to the location, design and construction of the parking spaces. Regional District standards with respect to the required number of spaces will also apply in any situations where the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure standards are lower, or where the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure has no jurisdiction.

AA) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 613 with the following:
Keeping of Farm Animals
613
1. Where the keeping of farm animals are permitted on lots outside the AG zones the following regulations shall be complied with:
   i. two (2) livestock for every 0.4 hectare, with the minimum lot size of 0.4 hectares;
   OR
   ii. six (6) sheep or goats for every 0.4 hectares, with the minimum lot size of 0.4 hectares;
   OR
   iii. twelve (12) head of poultry or rabbits for every 0.4 hectares, with the minimum lot size of 0.2 hectares.
   a. No buildings, structures or enclosures used for housing farm animals; no drinking or feeding troughs; and no manure piles may be located within 15 metres of a lot line of any property zoned R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, MFR-F or HR-I.
   b. Section 613 (1)(b) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for the grazing of animals.

BB) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 617 with the following:
Any mineral or mining management activity relating to the exploration or production of minerals, sand, gravel, coal or quarries that is classified a 'mineral' under the Mineral Tenure Act or a 'mine' the Mines Act shall not be restricted by any terms or conditions of this bylaw so long as the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources manages the activities and land for that purpose.

CC) Division 6 General Regulations by deleting Section 618.3. in its entirety.

DD) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 618.4. and 5. with the following:
4 Signs advertising community events or public service announcements or political campaign signs during an election are exempt from the requirements of Sections 618(1) and (2).
5 Signs associated with the operation of on-site businesses and activities such as parking, loading, vehicle movement, employee and visitor safety and other similar signs are exempt from the requirements of Sections 618 (1) and (2).

EE) Division 6 General Regulation by adding the following zoning designations to Section 619 in the corresponding order:
Multi-Family Residential – F (MFR-F)
FF) Division 6 General Regulations by adding the following as Section 620. 5.:  
In circumstances where a single lot is located in more than one zone, the provisions of this  
bylaw that regulate the use of land, buildings and structures; the density of the use of land,  
buildings, and structures; the siting, size, and dimension of buildings and structures, and uses  
permitted on the land; the location of uses on the land and within the building and structures;  
and the shape, dimension, and area of all parcels of land that may be created by subdivision;  
shall apply as if the zone boundary were a property line, and in the case of subdivision, be in  
compliance with the largest minimum area that applies to that lot or portion of the lot being  
created.

GG) Division 6 General Regulations by replacing Section 623. with the following:  
Pursuant to Section 489 of the Local Government Act, setback and height variances may be  
approved by the Regional District on a Development Permit where community plan objectives  
for the form and character of commercial, industrial and multi-family developments can be  
achieved provided that no siting variances cross a property line.

HH) Division 10 Suburban Residential K (R1K) by replacing Section 1002. 6. with the following:  
Secondary Suites and Carriage Houses shall not be used as tourist accommodation.

II) Division 11 Country Residential (R2) by replacing Section 1101. 2. with the following:  
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided for a relative under Section 514 of the Local  
Government Act, with the approval of the Interior Health Authority shall be 0.8 hectare.

JJ) Division 12 Country Residential I (R2I) by replacing Section 1201. 3. with the following:  
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided for a relative under Section 514 of the Local  
Government Act, with the approval of the Interior Health Authority shall be 0.8 hectare.

KK) Division 13 Country Residential K (R2K) by replacing Section 1301. 2. with the following:  
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided for a relative under Section 514 of the Local  
Government Act, with the approval of the Interior Health Authority shall be 0.8 hectare.

LL) Division 13 Country Residential K (R2K) by replacing Section 1302. 6. with the following:  
Secondary Suites and Carriage Houses shall not be used as tourist accommodation.

MM) Division 13 Country Residential K (R2K) by adding the following as Section 1303. 6.:  
A Temporary Guest Accommodation use and an Accessory Tourist Accommodation Use  
cannot be operated on the same lot at the same time.

NN) Division 14 Country Residential SA (R2SA – South Arrow) by replacing Section 1401. 2. with  
the following:  
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided for a relative under Section 514 of the Local  
Government Act, with the approval of the Interior Health Authority shall be 0.8 hectare.

OO) Division 14 Country Residential SA (R2SA – South Arrow) by adding the following as Section  
1402. 6.:  
A Temporary Guest Accommodation use and an Accessory Tourist Accommodation Use  
cannot be operated on the same lot at the same time.
PP) Division 15 Rural Residential (R3) by replacing Section 1501. 12. with the following:
Any building or structure for the purposes of cannabis micro cultivation, cannabis micro processing or cannabis nurseries shall be a minimum of 15 metres from all property lines, with the exception of a structure that has a base entirely of soil which may be located within 7.5 metres of a property line.

QQ) Division 16 Rural Residential I (R3I) by replacing Section 1601. 3. with the following:
The minimum parcel size for a parcel subdivided for a relative under Section 514 of the Local Government Act, with the approval of the Interior Health Authority shall be 1.6 hectares.

RR) Division 17 Rural Residential K (R3K) by replacing Section 1701. 10. with the following:
Any building or structure for the purposes of cannabis micro cultivation, cannabis micro processing or cannabis nurseries shall be a minimum of 15 metres from all property lines, with the exception of a structure that has a base entirely of soil which may be located within 7.5 metres of a property line.

SS) Division 17 Rural Residential K (R3K) by adding the following as Section 1703. 6.:
A Temporary Guest Accommodation use and an Accessory Tourist Accommodation Use cannot be operated on the same lot at the same time.

TT) Division 19 Rural Resource K (R4K) by adding the following as Section 1902. 7.:
A Temporary Guest Accommodation use and an Accessory Tourist Accommodation Use cannot be operated on the same lot at the same time.

UU) Division 20 Rural Resource (R4SA – South Arrow) by adding the following as Section 2002. 7.:
A Temporary Guest Accommodation use and an Accessory Tourist Accommodation Use cannot be operated on the same lot at the same time.

VV) Division 27 Agriculture 1 (AG1) by replacing Section 2700 with the following:
Subject to the British Columbia Agricultural Land Commission Act, Regulations and Orders, land, buildings and structures in the Agriculture 1 (AG1) zone shall be used for the following purposes only:
All activities designated as “Farm Use” as defined in the Agricultural Land Commission Act and Part 2 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation
Dwellings:
One-Family
Two-Family
Horse Riding Arena and Boarding Stables
Horticulture
Keeping of Farm Animals
Kennel
Micro Cultivation, Cannabis
Micro Processing, Cannabis
Nursery, Cannabis
Sale of Site Grown Farm Products
Small Scale Food Processing Facilities by Development Permit (with the exception of lands within Electoral Areas I and J-Lower Arrow/Columbia)
Standard Cultivation, Cannabis
Standard Processing, Cannabis
Veterinary Clinic
Accessory Uses:
   Accessory Buildings and Structures
   Accessory Tourist Accommodation
   Home Based Business
   Secondary Residences subject to Section 2701(3) and 2701(4)
   Portable Sawmills for processing of material harvested on site only

WW) Division 27 Agriculture 1 (AG1) by replacing Section 2701. 4. with the following:
   In addition to that permitted in section 2701(3); one manufactured home to be inhabited by a
   member of the immediate family of the owner of the principal dwelling may be permitted
   where:
   a. the manufactured home is not sited on a permanent foundation with a basement
      excavation;
   b. the manufactured home is removed from the property within 90 days when no longer
      required by the member of the immediate family; and
   c. the manufactured home is no wider than nine (9) metres.

   Additions, including porches, to a manufactured home permitted under this section shall not
   exceed 24 square metres in floor area.

XX) Division 27 Agriculture 1 (AG1) by replacing Section 2701. 6. with the following:
   Section 2701(5) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for
   the grazing of farm animals.

YY) Division 28 Agriculture 2 (AG2) by replacing Section 2800 with the following:
   Subject to the British Columbia Agricultural Land Commission Act, Regulations and Orders,
   land, buildings and structures in the Agriculture 2 (AG2) zone shall be used for the following
   purposes only:
   All activities designated as “Farm Use” as defined in the Agricultural Land Commission Act and
   Part 2 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation
   Dwellings:
      One-Family
      Two-Family
   Horse Riding Arena and Boarding Stables
   Horticulture
   Keeping of Farm Animals
   Kennel
   Micro Cultivation, Cannabis
   Micro Processing, Cannabis
   Nursery, Cannabis
   Sale of Site Grown Farm Products
   Small Scale Food Processing Facilities by Development Permit (with the exception of lands
   within Electoral Areas I and J-Lower Arrow/Columbia)
   Standard Cultivation, Cannabis
   Standard Processing, Cannabis
   Veterinary Clinic
   Accessory Uses:
Accessory Buildings and Structures
Accessory Tourist Accommodation
Home Based Business
Secondary Residences subject to Section 2801(3) and 2801(4)
Portable Sawmills for processing of material harvested on site only

ZZ) Division 28 Agriculture 2 (AG2) by replacing Section 2801. 4. with the following:
In addition to that permitted in section 2801(3); one manufactured home to be inhabited by a member of the immediate family of the owner of the principal dwelling may be permitted where:
a. the manufactured home is not sited on a permanent foundation with a basement excavation;
b. the manufactured home is removed from the property within 90 days when no longer required by the member of the immediate family; and
c. the manufactured home is no wider than nine (9) metres.

Additions, including porches, to a manufactured home permitted under this section shall not exceed 24 square metres in floor area.

AAA) Division 28 Agriculture 2 (AG2) by replacing Section 2801. 6. with the following:
Section 2801(5) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for the grazing of farm animals.

BBB) Division 29 Agriculture 3 (AG3) by replacing Section 2900 with the following:
Subject to the British Columbia Agricultural Land Commission Act, Regulations and Orders, land, buildings and structures in the Agriculture 3 (AG3) zone shall be used for the following purposes only:
All activities designated as “Farm Use” as defined in the Agricultural Land Commission Act and Part 2 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation
Dwellings:
One-Family
Two-Family
Horse Riding Arena and Boarding Stables
Horticulture
Keeping of Farm Animals
Kennel
Micro Cultivation, Cannabis
Micro Processing, Cannabis
Nursery, Cannabis Sale of Site Grown Farm Products
Small Scale Food Processing Facilities by Development Permit (with the exception of lands within Electoral Areas I and J-Lower Arrow/Columbia)
Standard Cultivation, Cannabis
Standard Processing, Cannabis
Veterinary Clinic
Accessory Uses:
Accessory Buildings and Structures
Accessory Tourist Accommodation
Home Based Business
Secondary Residences subject to Section 2901(3) and 2901(4)
Portable Sawmills for processing of material harvested on site only

CCC) Division 29 Agriculture 3 (AG3) by replacing Section 2901. 4. with the following:
In addition to that permitted in section 2901(3); one manufactured home to be inhabited by a member of the immediate family of the owner of the principal dwelling may be permitted where:

a. the manufactured home is not sited on a permanent foundation with a basement excavation;

b. the manufactured home is removed from the property within 90 days when no longer required by the member of the immediate family; and

c. the manufactured home is no wider than nine (9) metres.

Additions, including porches, to a manufactured home permitted under this section shall not exceed 24 square metres in floor area.

DDD) Division 29 Agriculture 3 (AG3) by replacing Section 2901. 6. with the following:
Section 2901(5) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for the grazing of farm animals.

EEE) Division 30 Agriculture 4 (AG4) by replacing Section 3000 with the following:
Subject to the British Columbia Agricultural Land Commission Act, Regulations and Orders, land, buildings and structures in the Agriculture 4 (AG4) zone shall be used for the following purposes only:
All activities designated as “Farm Use” as defined in the Agricultural Land Commission Act and Part 2 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation
Dwellings:
One-Family
Two-Family
Horse Riding Arena and Boarding Stables
Horticulture
Keeping of Farm Animals
Kennel
Micro Cultivation, Cannabis
Micro Processing, Cannabis
Nursery, Cannabis Sale of Site Grown Farm Products
Sale of Site Grown Farm Products
Small Scale Food Processing Facilities by Development Permit (with the exception of lands within Electoral Areas I and J-Lower Arrow/Columbia)
Standard Cultivation, Cannabis
Standard Processing, Cannabis
Veterinary Clinic
Accessory Uses:
Accessory Buildings and Structures
Accessory Tourist Accommodation
Home Based Business
Secondary Residences subject to Section 3001(3) and 3001(4)
Portable Sawmills for processing of material harvested on site only

FFF) Division 30 Agriculture 4 (AG4) by replacing Section 3001. 4. with the following:
In addition to that permitted in section 3001(3); one manufactured home to be inhabited by a member of the immediate family of the owner of the principal dwelling may be permitted where:

a. the manufactured home is not sited on a permanent foundation with a basement excavation;

b. the manufactured home is removed from the property within 30 days when no longer required by the member of the immediate family; and

c. the manufactured home is no wider than nine (9) metres.

Additions, including porches, to a manufactured home permitted under this section shall not exceed 24 square metres in floor area.

Division 30 Agriculture 4 (AG4) by replacing Section 3001. 6. with the following:

Section 3001(5) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for the grazing of farm animals.

Division 30 Agriculture 4 (AG4) by deleting Section 3001. 9. And 3001. 10.

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by replacing Section 3100 with the following:

Subject to the British Columbia Agricultural Land Commission Act, Regulations and Orders, land, buildings and structures in the Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) zone shall be used for the following purposes only:

All activities designated as “Farm Use” as defined in the Agricultural Land Commission Act and Part 2 of the Agricultural Land Reserve Use Regulation

Dwellings:
One-Family
Two-Family

Horse Riding Arena and Boarding Stables

Horticulture

Keeping of Farm Animals

Kennel

Micro Cultivation, Cannabis

Micro Processing, Cannabis

Nursery, Cannabis

Sale of Site Grown Farm Products

Small Scale Food Processing Facilities by Development Permit (with the exception of lands within Electoral Areas I and J-Lower Arrow/Columbia)

Standard Cultivation, Cannabis

Standard Processing, Cannabis

Veterinary Clinic

Accessory Uses:

Accessory Buildings and Structures

Accessory Tourist Accommodation

Home Based Business

Secondary Residences subject to Section 3101(3) and 3101(4)

Small Scale Wood Product Manufacturing subject to Section 3102

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by replacing Section 3101. 3. with the following:
No more than one one-family dwelling or two-family dwelling may be located on a lot except where a lot is classified as a farm under the Assessment Act, one additional one-family dwelling to accommodate people employed on the farm may be located on the lot as long as the lot is larger than four (4) hectares.

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by replacing Section 3101. 4, with the following:
In addition to that permitted in section 3101(3); one manufactured home to be inhabited by a member of the immediate family of the owner of the principal dwelling may be permitted where:
   a. the manufactured home is not sited on a permanent foundation with a basement excavation;
   b. the manufactured home is removed from the property within 90 days when no longer required by the member of the immediate family; and
   c. the manufactured home is no wider than nine (9) metres.
   d. Additions, including porches, to a manufactured home permitted under this section shall not exceed 24 square metres in floor area.

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by replacing Section 3101. 6, with the following:
Section 3101(5) does not apply to fences adjacent to lot lines that are used for enclosures for the grazing of farm animals.

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by deleting Section 3101. 9 and 3101. 10.

Division 31 Agriculture 4 K (AG4K) by adding Section 3103. 6. As follows:
Site Specific – Lot 10 District Lot 4274 Kootenay District Plan 1123 (PID 014-858-941). No building, structure or outdoor growing area for the purposes of Cannabis Micro Cultivation, Cannabis Micro Processing or Cannabis Nurseries may be located within 30 metres of a lot line in the R1, R2, R3, R4 zones. Cannabis Standard Cultivation and Cannabis Standard Processing are not permitted uses.

Division 33 General Commercial (C2) by amending Section 3300, as follows:
Replace “Warehousing;” with “Warehousing, restricted to:”

Division 34 Tourist Commercial (C3) by replacing Section 3401. 4, with the following:
Campgrounds adjacent to properties zoned for residential use must provide screening and buffering as follows:
   a. Where a proposed campground is located adjacent to a R1, R2, R5, R6, R7, MFR-F or HR-I zone, a minimum 7.5 metre wide buffer zone must be established.
   b. Where a proposed campground is located adjacent to a R3 or R4 zone, a minimum 5.0 metre wide buffer zone must be established.

In each case landscaping within the buffer zone shall comply with the requirements of sections 621 and 622.

Division 35 Heritage Commercial (C4) by deleting Sections 3500. and 3501. in their entirety.

Division 38 Resort Commercial (C6) by amending Section 3800, as follows:
Replace “Neighbourhood Pubs” with “Pubs”
Delete "Lake-Front Orientated Pub and/or Restaurant"

SSS) Division 38 Resort Commercial (C6) by replacing Section 3801.2. with the following:
Development in this zone may be subject to the requirements of a Development Permit.

TTT) Division 38 Resort Commercial (C6) by replacing Section 3801.4.b. with the following:
2.5 m (8.2 ft) of any other lot line; and/or

UUU) Division 39 Light Industrial (M1) by amending Section 3900. as follows:
Replace "Trucking Depot / Warehouse" with "Trucking Depot"
Replace "Warehousing: cold storage plants, feed and seed storage and distribution, mini
warehouses" with "Warehousing" and "Mini Warehouses"

WWW) Division 53 Comprehensive Development (CD2) by amending Section 5300. as follows:
Replace "Mini-warehouse Storage" with "Mini Warehouses"

WWW) Division 53 Comprehensive Development (CD2) by amending Section 5301.3. as follows:
Replace "Mini-warehouse Storage" with "Mini Warehouses"

XXX) Division 53 Comprehensive Development (CD2) by amending Section 5301.7. as follows:
Unless otherwise specified in a Development Permit, all buildings and structures except a
fence shall be setback a minimum distance of 7.5 metres (25 feet) from all public roads and
2.5 metres (8.2 feet) from all other lot lines.

YYY) By making such consequential changes as are required to reflect the foregoing
amendments, including without limitation changes in the numbering and Table of Contents of
the bylaw.

6 That Schedule ‘A’ of Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be
amended by

A) changing the Zoning Designation of Lot, 1 Section 12, Township 69, Kootenay District, Plan
14210 (PID 005-594-260) from Neighbourhood Commercial (C1) to Rural Residential K (R3K),
as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

B) changing the Zoning Designation of Lot 1, District Lot 398, Kootenay District, Plan 9779 Except
Plan NEP72569 (PID 010-641-645) from Light Industrial (M1) to Country Residential K (R2K),
as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

C) changing the Zoning Designation of Lot A, District Lot 398, Kootenay District, Plan NEP72569
(PID 025-578-693) from Light Industrial (M1) to Country Residential K (R2K), as shown on the
attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.

D) changing the Zoning Designation of Lot 10, District Lot 4274, Kootenay District, Plan 1123 (PID
014-858-941) from Country Residential K (R2K) to Agriculture 4 K (AG4K), as shown on the
attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw.
E) changing the Zoning Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) and Rural Residential K (R3K) to Open Space (OS) and Rural Residential K (R3K), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   a. Lot 1, DL 7896, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-521)
   b. Lot 5, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-554)
   c. Lot 6, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-572)
   d. Lot 7, DL 9152, Kootenay District, Plan EPP13247 (PID 028-740-581)
   e. District Lot 9152, Kootenay District, Except Plans NEP2353 & EPP13247 (PID 014-028-085)
   f. District Lot 9149, Kootenay District, Managed Forest No 105, NTS: /424-110 (PID 014-028-051)
   g. District Lot 7896, Kootenay District, Except Plan 5875 & 17177, Managed Forest No 105, NTS: /424-110 (PID 005-543-894)

F) changing the Zoning Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) and Environmental Reserve (ER) to Environmental Reserve (ER), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   a. Lot 1, District Lot 1784 Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-686-752)
   b. Lot 2, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-651-525)
   c. Lot 3, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-651-533)
   d. Lot 4, District Lot 1784, Kootenay District, Plan NEP1629 (PID 015-685-837)
   e. Lot 5 District Lot 1784 Kootenay District Plan 1629 (PID: 015-651-541)
   g. Lot 1, District Lot 1785, Kootenay District, Plan 1338 Except That Part of the Said Lot Lying West of a Line Parallel to and 440 Feet Distant from the Westerly Boundary Thereof (PID 015-868-087)
   h. Lot 2, District Lot 1785, Kootenay District, Plan 1338 (PID 015-867-811)
   i. Lot 1, District Lot 6549, Kootenay District, Plan 853 Except Plan 8798 (PID 028-573-137)

G) changing the Zoning Designation of the following lots from Agriculture 2 (AG2) and Open Space (OS) to Environmental Reserve (ER) as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:
   a. Lot 13, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 919 (PID 013-127-837)
   b. Lot 1, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 919 (PID 013-127-829)
   c. Lot 7B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 015-065-743)
   d. Lot 9B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 013-127-012)
   e. Lot 8B, District Lot 373, Kootenay District, Plan 861 Except Part in Plan 12126 (PID 013-126-997)
   f. District Lot 8566, Kootenay District,Except the Westerly 35 Chains (PID 013-123-751)
   g. Lot 13, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-531)
   h. Lot 11, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Part Included in Ref. Plan 403671 (PID 012-489-786)
   i. Block 10, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-417)
   j. Lot 9, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-450)
k. That Part of Lot 11 Included in Ref. Plan 403671, District Lot 8563, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 012-489-913)

l. Lot 17, District Lot 8563 and 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Part in Plan NEP2117 (PID 012-489-221)

m. Block 18, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-772-331)

n. Block 20, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-784-118)

o. Block 21, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-784-134)

p. Block 19, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-772-349)

q. West ⅎ of Block 22, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-793-010)

r. East ⅜ of Block 22, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-771-920)

s. Parcel B of Lot 23 of District Lot 8564, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Plan 142001 (PID 015-771-997)

t. District Lot 8565, Kootenay District (PID 012-490-636)

u. Parcel A of Lot 23 of District Lot 8564, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 Except Plan 142001 (PID 013-128-591)

v. Block 24, District Lot 8564, Kootenay District, Plan 1482 (PID 015-771-806)

H) changing the Zoning Designation of the following lots from Open Space (OS) to Environmental Reserve (ER), as shown on the attached Schedule A forming part of the Bylaw:


b. Block 47, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 915 (PID 013-127-063)

c. Lot 110, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-110)

d. Lot 111, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-128)

e. Lot 112, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-161)

f. Lot 113, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-187)

g. Lot 114, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-209)

h. Lot 115, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-217)

i. Lot 121, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-365)

j. Lot 116, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-241)

k. Lot 120, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-322)

l. Lot 117, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-268)

m. Lot 119, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-314)


o. Lot 118, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 924 (PID 013-127-292)

p. Parcel B (Ref. Plan 889471) of Block 45, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 1005 (PID 013-127-918)

q. Block 1, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-060)

r. Block 2, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-132)

s. Parcel A (See 1560561) of Block 48, District Lot 183A, Kootenay District, Plan 915 (PID 013-127-071)

t. Block 3, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-159)

u. Block 4, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-183)

v. Block 5, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-221)

w. Block 6, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-281)

x. Block 7, District Lot 7159, Kootenay District, Plan 1376 (PID 013-128-302)

This Bylaw shall come into force and effect upon its adoption.
This Bylaw may be cited as “Regional District of Central Kootenay Bylaw No. 2680, 2019.”

READ A FIRST TIME this 21st day of November, 2019.

READ A SECOND TIME this 21st day of November, 2019.

WHEREAS A PUBLIC HEARING was held this 16th day of December, 2019.

READ A THIRD TIME this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

ADOPTED this [Date] day of [Month], 20XX.

Aimee Watson, Board Chair

Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer
From: Neighbourhood Commercial (C1)
To: Rural Residential (R3K)
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SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to consider a land use amendment to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004. This application seeks to amend the zoning of the subject property from Institutional (I) to Suburban Residential (R1) in order to allow the applicant to renovate the existing building into a single-family dwelling.

Staff is recommending that Bylaw No. 2690 being a Bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be adopted.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Owner:</strong> Jennifer Derco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Location:</strong> 2489 Purdy Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Description:</strong> Lot 15, Block 9, Plan NEP2933, District Lot 237, Kootenay Land District (PID: 008-384-843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Size:</strong> 0.17 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning:</strong> Institutional (I) under RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCP Designation:</strong> Suburban Residential (SR) under Kootenay-Columbia Rivers Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1157, 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 BACKGROUND/SITE CONTEXT

The properties are located in Raspberry to the north of the City of Castlegar within Electoral Area ‘J’. The three parcels are surrounded by land zoned Suburban Residential (R1). The parcels are designated Suburban Residential (SR) under Kootenay-Columbia Rivers Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1157, 1996 and as such the proposed zoning amendments are in alignment with the intent of the Official Community Plan and the associated future land use designation does not require further amendment.

The proposed Bylaw Amendment is to change the zoning to Suburban Residential (R1) for the purpose of allowing a dwelling as a principle use on the subject property which is currently zoned Institutional (I) under RDCK Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004. The applicant intends to renovate the existing building to accommodate a single-family dwelling.
The subject property and adjacent property are historically significant traditional Doukhobor homes. The intent of the applicant is to restore and repair the subject property for the purpose of a single family dwelling. Staff encourage the applicant to retain the historical character defining elements of the building when undergoing restoration. Some of these elements include the hipped roof, non-ornamental brick exterior and matching windows.

The photo below shows the buildings as they were originally. Behind the buildings was a U-shaped 1-storey structure that formed a partial courtyard, this part of the structure no longer exists.


SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

| Included in Financial Plan: □ YES ☒ NO | Financial Plan Amendment: □ YES ☒ NO |
| Debt Bylaw Required: □ YES ☒ NO | Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d: □ YES ☒ NO |

The $1600 application fee was received in accordance with the Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2457, 2015.

b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):

This application was processed in accordance with the Planning Procedures and Fees Bylaw No. 2547, 2015.

c. Environmental Considerations:

Environmental impacts are not anticipated as the lot has been cleared of natural vegetation.
d. Social Considerations:
Impact to surrounding residents is anticipated to be minimal due to the nature of the proposal and the residential character of the neighbourhood.

e. Economic Considerations:
Restoration of the existing building is anticipated to be a positive impact for the community.

f. Communication Considerations:
A public hearing was held on November 28, 2019, wherein Staff, the Area Director, and the applicant attended. No one from the public attended this meeting, nor were there any submissions received.

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

DISCUSSION

The applicant has stated that the purpose of the application is to amend the Institutional (I) zoning to Suburban Residential (R1) in order to renovate the property for residential use. The subject property is currently vacant. The proposed rezoning would amend the properties to align with the Kootenay-Columbia Rivers Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 1157, 1996 which has the properties designated as Suburban Residential (SR). The surrounding properties are similarly designated Suburban Residential (SR) and zoned Suburban Residential (R1). The proposed zoning of the subject property reflects the historic use of the lands for the purposes of residential use. The three adjacent properties which were formerly zoned Institutional (I) were rezoned to residential at the Regional Board Meeting in March 2019.

The proposed Land Use Amendment is consistent with the surrounding residential neighbourhood, which is zoned Suburban Residential (R1). Consequently, Staff recommends ‘Option 1’, which to adopt the amendment bylaw.

OPTIONS

Option 1

1. That Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019 being a bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be ADOPTED; AND FURTHER that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Option 2

1. THAT no further action be taken with respect to the Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019 being a bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004.
SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Regional District of Central Kootenay Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019 being a bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 is hereby ADOPTED; AND FURTHER that the Chair and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the same.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Eileen Senyk, Planner

CONCURRENCE

Planning Manager
General Manager of Development Services
Chief Administrative Officer

Initials:

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Bylaw No. 2690

A Bylaw to amend Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to amend the Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004, and amendments thereto.

NOW THEREFORE the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay, in open meeting assembled, HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

APPLICATION

1. That Schedule 'A' of Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw No. 1675, 2004 be amended by changing the Zoning Designation of Lot 15, Block 9, Plan NEP2933, District Lot 237, Kootenay Land District (PID 008-384-843) from Institutional (I) to Suburban Residential (R1), as shown on the attached Map.

2. This Bylaw shall come into force and effect upon its adoption.

CITATION

3. This Bylaw may be cited as "Regional District of Central Kootenay Zoning Bylaw Amendment No. 2690, 2019."

READ A FIRST TIME this 19 day of September , 2019.

READ A SECOND TIME this 19 day of September , 2019.

WHEREAS A PUBLIC HEARING was held this 28 day of November , 2019.

READ A THIRD TIME this 12 day of December , 2019.

ADOPTED this [Date] day of [Month] , 2019.

Aimee Watson, Board Chair

Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer
Schedule 'A' of Amendment Bylaw No. 2690, 2019
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REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Bylaw No. 2691

A Bylaw to establish a service within Electoral Areas E and H to regulate special events.

WHEREAS Supplementary Letters Patent were issued to the Regional District of Central Kootenay which granted the authority to impose a license fee and conditions upon any function, gathering, or entertainment for which a fee is charged either directly or indirectly for attendance;

AND WHEREAS a regional district is required, by bylaw, to establish a service to exercise authority granted by Order in Council but not exercised prior to the enactment of the Local Government Act;

AND WHEREAS pursuant of the Local Government Act, the Board wishes to establish a regulatory service for the purpose of controlling special events for Electoral Areas E and H;

AND WHEREAS pursuant of the Local Government Act, the requirement that an establishing bylaw contain a maximum requisition amount for the service does not apply to an establishing bylaw for a regulatory service;

AND WHEREAS pursuant of the Local Government Act, participating area approval may be obtained, by consent, if the participating area includes all of the electoral area and the service can be established without borrowing;

AND WHEREAS pursuant of the Local Government Act, the Directors of Electoral Areas E and H have consented, in writing, to the adoption of this bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Board of the Regional District of Central Kootenay, in open meeting assembled, HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

1 The Regional District hereby establishes a service, to be known as the "Regional District of Central Kootenay Special Events Permit Service" to regulate special events.

2 The participants of the service established under Section 1 of this bylaw shall be Electoral Areas E and H.

3 Pursuant of the Local Government Act, the annual cost of providing the service shall be recovered by one or more of the following:
   a. Property value taxes
   b. fees and charges;
   c. revenues raised by other means; or
   d. revenues received by way of the agreement, enterprise, gift, grant, or otherwise.
This Bylaw may be cited as "Regional District of Central Kootenay Special Events Permit Service Establishment Bylaw No. 2691, 2019"

READ A FIRST TIME this 17th day of October, 2019.

READ A SECOND TIME this 17th day of October, 2019.

READ A THIRD TIME this 17th day of October, 2019.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the "Regional District of Central Kootenay Special Events Permit Service Establishment Bylaw No. 2691, 2019" as read a third time by the Regional District of Central Kootenay Board on the 17th day of October, 2019.

Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer

APPROVED by the Inspector of Municipalities on the 19th day of December, 2019.

ASSENT RECEIVED as per the Local Government Act – Consent on behalf of electoral participating area.

ADOPTED this 16th day of January, 2020

Aimee Watson, Board Chair

Mike Morrison, Corporate Officer
**SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to recommend to the Board a Feasibility Fund project in the amount of $80,000 toward an estimated $95,000 study to investigate the feasibility of a new recreation service to deliver regional community facilities/services to the residents of either of all, a portion or none of the Areas, E, F, H, I, J and the municipalities of Castlegar, Nelson and Slocan.

**SECTION 2: BACKGROUND**

Campbell Field, which was donated for recreational use, could be a strategic site for a RDCK recreation facility due to its strategic location between Nelson and Castlegar. The Board passed the following resolution (from the All Recreation Committee) in June 2017:

366/17 That the Regional District of Central Kootenay Directors from Castlegar, Nelson, Areas E, F, H, I and J meet to discuss the opportunities to jointly benefit the residents of the area at Campbell field;

AND FURTHER, that RC Strategies and Professional Environmental Recreation Consultants (PERC) be retained to facilitate the discussion.

This project was delayed until the completion of the referendum process to expand the current RDCK recreation complex for the Castlegar and District service area. The process with RC Strategies started in April 2019.

This initial process is now complete and summarised in the October 2019 Campbell Field Planning – Initial Partnership Discussions Summary Report. The following is an overview of the report:

“When the Regional District of Central Kootenay (RDCK) acquired Campbell Field from the South Slocan Sports Association, a commitment was made to carry on the legacy of the site as a valued and utilized community recreation hub. Located within Area H of the RDCK, local decision makers set out with a blank canvas to explore the future potential of the site as a recreation hub for both Area H residents as well as others in the broader market area.

The first step in this exploration was to complete the Area H Recreation Master Plan (under separate cover). The Master Plan, and the associated research and community engagement conducted to build it, provided great insight as to Area H resident priorities and preferences and about the merits of partnering to provide recreation services. Realizing this, and that other nearby areas within the RDCK, including the City of Castlegar and the City of Nelson had
completed similar plans, the facilitation of a broader conversation around potential of the site and partnership opportunities was initiated. Beyond RDCK Areas and the three municipalities, local school authorities and other recreation stakeholders were also identified as important to include in this broader conversation.

A simple process was followed that introduced potential partners to the site and gathered preliminary input, feedback and commitment from potential partners to determine whether or not recreation amenity development at Campbell Field would impact their own constituencies. “

The complete report is attached for information.

The goal of the process was to measure the level of interest to continue to explore the idea of the feasibility of a new recreation service.

The next stage is evaluating the feasibility of a new service. This will be comprised of two stages to test citizens and political willingness to move forward (from the October 2019 Campbell Field Planning – Initial Partnership Discussions Summary Report):

Stage 1: Confirming needs

• There must be public engagement in the planning process, preferably through the use of statistically reliable surveys.

• A market assessment for component service delivery functions must be completed.

• The project must demonstrate conformance to the broader regional/municipal strategic planning.

Stage 2: Analyzing costs and benefits

• Business planning outlining capital partners, operating partners, sources of capital, capital amortization, and projection of operating costs must be completed.

• There must be a concept development plan including infrastructure planning, costs, and impacts of ongoing operations.

The partners still involved in the conversation now have enough information to move forward with gathering insight and information from respective constituencies outlining what might provide recreational value to them and further defining how, or if, they might get involved. Regardless of who is still on the bus after Stage 1 and Stage 2, getting on it together at this stage is testament to the spirit of collaboration in the region and a show of good faith and good governance when contemplating future public service delivery.

SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Plan Amendment:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feasibility Phase Cost (As per Quote):

| Stage 1 - Confirming Needs: | $36,000 |
| Stage 2 – Analysing Costs and Benefits: | $13,650 |
| Disbursements: | $5,958 |
| RDCK Cost Allowance (Project Management, GIS, rentals, materials, travel) | $14,392 |
| Additional Design Allowance | $30,000 |
| **Total Allowance** | **$95,000** |

The additional design allowance is additional to the proposal and is a staff recommendation to enter into architectural schematic design phase to improve project scope and costing estimates if needed by the partners. The services in Phase 1 and 2 of the feasibility analysis include architectural conceptual design.

This $80,000 from the feasibility fund is not included in the 2020 Financial Plan at this time. The additional Funding from Area H South Recreation Service of $15,000 is included in the 2020 Financial Plan.

The current balance in the feasibility fund reserve is $224,730.14.

b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):

RDCK Policy: FEASIBILITY STUDY RESERVE FUND - Number: 300-04-02

As per the policy $10,000 per participant can be requested for funding. The total funding request is for $80,000 (8 participants * $10,000).

As per the policy a quote is provided for the Feasibility Phase Cost to be completed by contract and is attached. The RDCK cost allowance is as detailed. The additional design allowance is to commit feasibility funding for future work to be recommended by the partners at a future date.

c. Environmental Considerations:

The schematic design phase of a project begins the investigation into the environmental impacts of a project. The impacts are defined in greater detail during the design development phase. The RDCK does not have building performance criteria.

d. Social Considerations:

Phase 1 - Confirming Needs includes extensive public consultations to evaluate what community benefits citizens will want from a project at Campbell Field as defined by RDCK research through Master Plan and Fees and Charges reports.

Phase 2 - Analysing Costs and Benefits will quantify the social benefits vs costs for the partners and Board to consider.
e. Economic Considerations:
Phase 2 - Preliminary investigation into the lifetime costs of building and operating a new recreation service will be quantified for the partners and Board to consider.

f. Communication Considerations:
The plan includes a number of communication engagement strategies to increase public involvement in the process. This includes videos, written and digital surveys, group and public meetings.

Note: This type of project still relies on staff to assist in the communication of and participation in the public engagement process. Consultants lean on staff to provide advice and to execute on communication strategies. Although staff are actively engaged in our communities, without a communication/marketing administrator being readily available with the skills and time required to do this effectively, this often does not get the attention or expertise required to make the process as successful as it should be. The result is that the consultations often only engages or “hears from” the best organised groups versus being truly representative of the community.

g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:
This project is led by the General Manager of Community Services as the service is “new”. This project’s timely progress is threatened by other departmental staffing concerns and projects. Although this project is a priority it could have an extended timeline to complete due to staffing resources.

h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:
This project is a priority of the All Recreation Committee and supported by the Board.

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS
Funding from the feasibility reserve will allow for the engagement of an experienced consulting firm to lead the project. This is the only way to successfully complete the next step in the process to define the feasibility of the strategic recreational value of Campbell Field.

As per the policy: Directors may access a maximum of one draw on the Feasibility Study Reserve Fund per year and must have contributed an amount at least equivalent to his/her draw, except with permission of the Board.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
That the Board approve $95,000 be included in the 2020 Financial Plan to fund the Campbell Field Feasibility Study with $80,000 to be funded from the RDCK Feasibility Study Reserve Fund and the remaining $15,000 be funded from the Area H South Recreation Service S231; AND FURTHER, that RC Strategies be retained at a cost not to exceed $55,608 plus applicable taxes to complete Campbell Field Feasibility Services.

Respectfully submitted,
Signature:

[Signature]
Name: Joe Chirico, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

Chief Administrative Officer
Corporate Officer

Initials:

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Initial Partnership Discussions Summary Report
Attachment B – Campbell Field Feasibility Services
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Introduction and Methodology

When the Regional District of Central Kootenay (RDCK) acquired Campbell Field from the South Slocan Sports Association, a commitment was made to carry on the legacy of the site as a valued and utilized community recreation hub. Located within Area H of the RDCK, local decision makers set out with a blank canvas to explore the future potential of the site as a recreation hub for both Area H residents as well as others in the broader market area.

The first step in this exploration was to complete the Area H Recreation Master Plan (under separate cover). The Master Plan, and the associated research and community engagement conducted to build it, provided great insight as to Area H resident priorities and preferences and about the merits of partnering to provide recreation services. Realizing this, and that other nearby areas within the RDCK, including the City of Castlegar and the City of Nelson had completed similar plans, the facilitation of a broader conversation around potential of the site and partnership opportunities was initiated. Beyond RDCK Areas and the three municipalities, local school authorities and other recreation stakeholders were also identified as important to include in this broader conversation.

The following organizations were invited by the RDCK Area H to be part of this broader discussion about the future of Campbell Field:

1. The Village of Slocan
2. The City of Castlegar
3. The City of Nelson
4. RDCK Area E
5. RDCK Area F
6. RDCK Area I
7. RDCK Area J
8. School District No. 20
9. School District No. 8
10. Recreation Sites & Trails BC

Each of these organizations is in some way involved in the provision of recreation and many have existing plans or policies in place about recreation and its value to respective constituents.
In May of 2019, a consulting company familiar with the area was hired by the RDCK (Area H) to facilitate initial discussions about the site with potential partners. A simple process was followed (explained below) that introduced potential partners to the site and gathered preliminary input, feedback and commitment from potential partners to determine whether or not recreation amenity development at Campbell Field would impact their own constituencies.

Documentation was reviewed, a survey was facilitated and two meeting were hosted to begin a conversation about the future of Campbell Field. This report outlines the findings of this preliminary conversation about Campbell Field and outlines key next steps.
About Campbell Field

Campbell Field is an 8.6 acre parcel of land that has been acquired by the Regional District of Central Kootenay. The parcel is adjacent to Mount Sentinel Senior Secondary and the Slocan Valley Rail Trail and is proposed to be the site of indoor and/or outdoor recreation amenities to service residents of, and visitors to, the Regional District of Central Kootenay. The site is located in Area H.

The site is approximately halfway between the City of Castlegar and the City of Nelson and sees daily traffic counts of 11,000+ vehicles. As well, there are a number of recreation assets around the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topography</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Servicing</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Public Transportation**         | • Playmor Junction Park-N-Ride  
• BC Transit Playmor Exchange |
| **Active Transportation**         | • Paved portion of Slocan Valley Rail Trail  
• MOTI pedestrian tunnel  
• TransCanada Trail |
| **Neighbouring Water Access**     | • Slocan River  
• Kootenay River (Slocan Pools) |
| **Neighbouring Schools**          | • Mount Sentinel Secondary School  
• Brent Kennedy Elementary School |
| **Site Boundary Assets**          | • SD8 Secondary School  
• RSTBC Rail Trail |
| **Covenants / Easements**         | • Right of Way School District 8  
• Covenant restricts the use of land to:  
  » Recreational services and facilities  
  » Parks and playgrounds  
  » Conservation area and ecological reserves  
  » Interpretive centres  
  » Cultural services and facilities |
| **RDCK Assets**                   | • Crescent Valley Fire Department  
• Crescent Valley Beach Regional Park  
• South Slocan Schoolhouse |
Initial Partner Input

The purpose of the initial planning session, hosted in May of 2019 was to discuss the future of the Campbell Field site and more specifically the following from the perspective of each invited organization:

- Their organizations’ individual strategic goals and outcomes as they relate to quality of life;
- The potential of the Campbell Field site to help them achieve their goals and outcomes;
- The recreational needs of their community;
- Potential amenities to develop on the site;
- The benefits of partnering on the Campbell Field site development; and
- Level of interest in partnering on the site’s development.

In order to best prepare for the initial session, a survey was sent out to participants beforehand. The following section explains the results of this survey. It is important to note that these results are indicative of those who completed the survey and do not represent or bind any potential partner organizations; it was simply meant to “break the ice”.

In total there were 13 responses representing:

- Area H, Area I, Area F, Area J, City of Castlegar, City of Nelson, School District No. 8

Respondents were asked if they were aware that the RDCK had acquired Campbell Field?

- 12 indicated they were aware, 1 indicated they were not
Respondents were asked if their constituency has outstanding needs for recreation. 84% stated that they did.

The following amenities were most frequently mentioned as “needed” in respective constituencies.

1. Indoor dry land (9 mentions)
2. Indoor specialty areas (8)
3. Indoor ice (5)
4. Indoor aquatics (4)
5. Outdoor specialty areas (4)
6. Outdoor trails (3)
7. Outdoor active use areas (2)

When asked what best describes your community/constituency regarding future planning and involvement in recreation amenity development at Campbell Field?

- 6 were unsure
- 5 were interested in partnering initially and
- 2 suggested that new recreation amenities at the site “don’t have impact to our community/constituency”

Finally, respondents were asked to provide final comments. The following are taken verbatim from the survey results.

- Hopefully this is a start at developing facilities regionally.
- This will increasingly become an important property for rec development as we grow.
- Residents may prefer to see improvements to the Castlegar Complex.
- Interested in hearing from others and being part of the dialogue.
- There is no track and field facility in the Kootenays.

Based on the findings of the initial survey, and discussions at the first session, all potential partners were invited to and participated in the second session (hosted in October, 2019)
Catchment Area Discussion

One of the most important questions that needed to be answered at the second session (October, 2019) was about how broad the impact of recreation amenity development at Campbell Field could be. In other words, what would a market catchment area look like for certain types of amenities at the site?

The Area H Recreation Master Plan survey provided some insight into this as it included a survey question around willingness to travel. 34% of Area H residents were willing to travel over 40 minutes to access recreation; 67% were willing to travel over 20 minutes.

Further to this local research, there are academic studies that have been developed to try to measure when travel time becomes a barrier to participation in certain types of recreation activities. Studies out of Germany and Canada (Halifax) shed some light on the topic.

The following thresholds were found via research in Germany.

- Running – 17.6 minutes
- Swimming – 28.8 minutes
- Track and field – 29.2 minutes
- Soccer – 31.5 minutes
- Basketball 33.1 minutes
- Handball – 34.4 minutes

Research conducted in Canada was not as specific as it related to certain activity types but confirmed travel time thresholds of between **15-40 minutes** but also stated the relevance and important of other factors such as quality of experience, uniqueness of experience and nature of program as also having dramatic impact on willingness to travel. The appendix outlines more detailed research about willingness to travel as it relates to recreation activities.

Based on this information, the RDCK GIS personnel conducted spatial analysis around the site outlining 20, 30 and 40 minute drive times from Campbell Field and the populations (and tax implications) that would be impacted by the introduction of new recreation amenities at the site. The following key points summarize what was concluded:

1. A recreation amenity at Campbell Field would service a population of approximately 27,000 based on a 20 minute catchment area; in comparison The major recreation centres in Castlegar and Nelson service populations of approximately 14,000 and 16,000 residents considering a 20 minute catchment area.

2. A recreation amenity at Campbell Field would have 50% to 66% the tax impact that the facilities in Castlegar and Nelson currently have based on a 20 minutes catchment *assumes a hypothetical service including all Areas invited to the discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>House Points</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute</td>
<td>12,566</td>
<td>27,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Minute</td>
<td>15,029</td>
<td>33,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Minute</td>
<td>16,357</td>
<td>35,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost to households per $100,000 of assessment for $1,000,000 of taxation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catchment</th>
<th>Campbell Field</th>
<th>Present 222</th>
<th>Present 226</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Minute</td>
<td>$16.10</td>
<td>$32.86</td>
<td>$22.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Minute</td>
<td>$14.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Minute</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

This preliminary discussion about the future of Campbell Field and its potential to meet recreational needs in Area H and beyond cast a broad net. It involved a number of stakeholders within the RDCK and beyond and took a broad look at respective recreation needs, gathered input and insight from potential partners, and provided initial indications of what market catchment areas could look like for recreation on the site.

Next steps associated with planning for future recreation development at Campbell Field are outlined as follows. It is important to note that all partners involved in the initial conversation have committed to be part of at least Stage 1 (Confirming Needs) of a more detailed research and site planning process.

1. Confirm initial/preliminary commitment from all partners to proceed with feasibility analysis process (2 stage)
2. Conduct feasibility analysis stage 1
3. Confirm commitment to move on to stage 2 of the feasibility analysis process
4. Confirm formal project commitment upon acceptance of stage 2 of the feasibility analysis process
5. Follow direction set in feasibility analysis (proceed with project or not): 1) design, 2) construction, 3) use of the amenity

More specifically, the following outlines the types of information and analysis that should occur during Stages 1 and 2 of the feasibility process.

Stage 1: Confirming needs

- There must be public engagement in the planning process, preferably through the use of statistically reliable surveys.
- A market assessment for component service delivery functions must be completed.
- The project must demonstrate conformance to the broader regional/municipal strategic planning.

Stage 2: Analyzing costs and benefits

- Business planning outlining capital partners, operating partners, sources of capital, capital amortization, and projection of operating costs must be completed.
- There must be a concept development plan including infrastructure planning, costs, and impacts of ongoing operations.

The partners involved in the conversation now have enough information to move forward with gathering insight and information from respective constituencies outlining what might provide recreational value to them and further defining how, or if, they might get involved. Regardless of who is still on the bus after Stage 1 and Stage 2, getting on it together at this stage is testament to the spirit of collaboration in the region and a show of good faith and good governance when contemplating future public service delivery.
Appendix: Research abstracts related to willingness to travel to access recreation

- Research examining recreational behaviors in Halifax suggests that individuals are willing to travel between 14 and 30 minutes to participate in an activity (e.g. 30 minutes for golfing, closer to 15 minutes for activities such as exercising, swimming, skating, etc.). Within the Halifax region, this equates to a total travel distance of between 4 and 24 km. Individuals that travel further for activities (90th percentile) report spending between 25-40 minutes travelling distances that range between 13 and 48 kilometres. Overall, different recreational activities have different sized travelsheds (time and distance), with activities such as golfing and skiing having among the larger travelshed sizes (Spinney & Millward, 2012).

- Research examining water and environmental quality effects on user willingness to travel suggests that users may travel upwards of 60 minutes further “for every one-metre increase in water clarity” (Keeler et al., 2015, p.76). This finding suggests that quality is also an important consideration in terms of understanding user willingness to travel to access recreational amenities, particularly when it comes to water bodies and water courses.

- Individuals are willing to spend different amounts of time to access recreational facilities depending on the type of activity that they are participating in. A study examining travel time behavior of recreational users in Germany suggests that individuals are willing to spend a maximum of 18 -35 minutes travelling to access facilities or amenities, depending on the type of activity. Running and general fitness (18 minutes and 22 minutes, respectively) have the lowest maximum time travel thresholds, whereas activities such as volleyball, soccer, basketball and handball have the highest (between 32 and 35 minutes). (Pawlowski et al., 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport/Activity</th>
<th>Mean Maximum Time in Minutes Users Are Willing to Travel To Access a Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Running</td>
<td>17.6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>28.8 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>21.7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>31.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>24.1 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>27.9 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>33.2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>30.1 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>28.7 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>33.1 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>34.4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodybuilding</td>
<td>22.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>29.2 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table adapted from Pawlowski et al., 2009, p.229-230: descriptive statistics, time variables; combined MTIME variables for Stuttgart & Cologne, Germany; mean maximums for both cities combined and divided by 2, based on a data set of approximately 6,000 survey responses)
• Research out of Germany suggests that for every 5% increase in the amount of time a user must spend accessing a facility, demand for spaces decreases by between 7-11% depending on the activity. Based on a sample size of 5,000 German recreation facility users, different facilities, too have different distance thresholds: around 7 km for basketball facilities, around 8 km for tennis facilities, and around 5.7 km for swimming facilities. Users reported greater willingness to travel further to access handball (14 km) and volleyball facilities (Pawlowski, Breuer & Wicker, 2007).

• Research out of the Netherlands examining proximity of recreation facilities (gym spaces, sports grounds, tennis courts and indoor pools) suggests that children that have a gym facility within 2.5 kilometres of their home are more than likely to join a sports club (approximately 13% greater likelihood than those not within 2.5 km of such a facility. This proximity effect is also observed between urban/rural households, with children in rural households that live close (i.e. 2.5 km) to gym facilities approximately 10% more likely to participate in sports (Steinmayr, Felfe & Lechner, 2011).

• Conflict between user groups or crowdedness of amenities are also factors that help explain user travel behavior. A survey of 1,200 forest users in Denmark explored willingness to travel to forested areas for recreational activities. The study found that certain population groups (i.e. mountain bikers, horse riders, the elderly) are willing to travel an additional 4 km to access forests they perceive to be less busy, in addition to the base preferred distance of 6 km (Bakhtiari, Jacobsen & Jensen, 2014).

• Research examining user travel thresholds to access water recreation environment in Helsinki suggests that individuals are willing to travel further (1.7 km or 24 minutes on foot) to access water environments than is generally assumed to be the standard distance threshold for green spaces within the academic literature (around 3-400 m walking distances). This finding helps to support the notion that different recreational amenities have different time/distance thresholds. Residents of Helsinki reported being willing to travel approximately 13 km (27 minutes) via car, 10 km (54 minutes) via public transit, and 4 km (15 minutes) via bicycle to access water recreational environments. Transportation mode may also affect user willingness or ability to travel further distances to access amenities (Laatikainen et al., 2017).

• A study of Western Australian adults examined variables associated with different distances individuals travel to reach various recreational amenities. The mean distance study participants travelled to reach recreational amenities (i.e. rec. centre, beaches/ rivers, parks) was around 5.5 km, +/- around 5.2 km. Younger adults travelled further to access beaches and rivers than older adults (7.3 km vs 6.0 km), individuals in socio-economically lower areas travel further than those in more affluent areas (8.1 km vs 7.3 km) and members of clubs travel further than non-members to use parks or ovals (4.2 km vs. 3.4 km). (McCormack et al., 2006)

• However, it is important to recognize that there is little consensus within the literature as to specific time/distance thresholds for facilities. However, there is recognition that distance effects vary based on geography and sport type. In general, distance likely negatively affects sports participation frequency, but this is more acutely observed within certain sports over other, for example, swimming (Deeleen, Ettema & Dijst, 2006).

• Geographic research into ‘sports geographies’ suggest that concepts such as range (maximum distance users are willing to travel to access a facility) and threshold (minimum number of participants needed to provide services at a facility) are not only affected by physical location of facilities relative to populations, but that factors such as the “quality/state of the infrastructure…city size…perceived versus actual distance…availability of sport facilities…gender…and school location” are important determinants of user behavior as well (O’Reilly et al., 2015, p. 295). Whether a facility is designed for regional use (e.g. larger facility, multi-sport amenities, higher quality/intensity amenities) or neighbourhood (e.g. single-sport, lower quality/intensity) impacts a facility’s catchment area, but quality of design and amenities, too are important ‘pull factors’ for users that can act against distance constraints. Users are willing to travel further to access higher quality infrastructure.

• Research examining adolescent perceptions of access to parks and physical activity facilities within their neighbourhood finds that perception and individual motivation are potentially more important factors explaining adolescent participation rates in sports than objective distance to facilities alone (Prins et al., 2009).
Background Literature


This study examined time-diary, individual GPS device data, and national (Canadian) time-use data (General Social Survey – Time Use) to examine both distance and time thresholds associated with a variety of recreation and sport activities. Findings based on data provided by approximately 2,000 respondents over a two-day travel time diary period, with respondents living in the Halifax, NS region.

The study examines respondent willingness to travel to participate in several activities: exercising/yoga, golfing, swimming, football/basketball/baseball, bowling/billiards, skating/skiing, and walking. Findings suggest that individuals are willing to travel between 14 and 30 minutes depending on the activity (e.g. 30 minutes for golfing, closer to 15 minutes for every other activity), or, between 4.2 and 24 km when examining distance (again, further for some activities such as golf, football/basketball/baseball and skating/skiing). Respondents within the 90th percentile (i.e. travel the longest time or distance) travel for longer time periods (between 25-40 minutes) and distances (13 – 48 km). The authors conclude that golfing, skating and skiing have the largest travelsheds (i.e. time and distance) among activities examined.

Quotes/Highlights

• “duration-based and distance-based travelsheds are generally in the order of 15-30 minutes and 4-20 km, respectively.” (474)
• “it is also useful to consider the type of services or size of a facility, because they may also affect the drawing power of the facility, and hence its travel-distance threshold (ie, service range)” (475)
• “rural residents are conditioned to travel longer distances” (475)


This study examined recreational users’ geotagged photographs to determine the effect of water and environmental quality on willingness to travel to access high quality rivers and lakes. The authors discovered that “users were willing to travel 56 minutes farther (equivalent to US$22 in travel costs) for every one-meter increase in water clarity” (76). The authors compared geotagged information contained in photos with user-reported ‘hometowns’ to determine distance travelled to access lakes in Minnesota and Iowa.
**Table adapted from Table 5, p.229-230: descriptive statistics, time variables; combined MTIM variables for Stuttgart & Cologne, divided by 2**

### Quotes/Highlights

- “Based on detailed city-specific information about recreational sports demand (i.e., determinants of travel time spending behavior) it is possible to develop a sport-specific facility allocation model (decentralized versus centralized) subject to the socio-demographic status of the sport consumers…management decisions regarding the closing/restoring/renovation of sports facilities (e.g., gyms) already in existence should be based on information about sport consumers’ travel time behavior to increase efficiency.”

- Data was gathered from sports users in Cologne and Stuttgart Germany, with more than 6,500 responses analyzed. Users were asked to provide a time estimate for how long it takes to reach a sport facility of their most practiced sport, as well as the maximum time they were willing to travel to reach such a facility.

- Study suggests that different activities have different time-travel thresholds, that factors such as age, and other socio-economic variables affect maximum distances individuals are willing to travel, and that those that more regularly practice a sport are more willing to travel further to do so (suggesting that those that practice less regularly are more sensitive to time/distance increases).

The authors analyzed data collected from 5,000 “German sport service consumers” examining how much time was needed for users to reach sports facilities and “maximum willingness to spend if necessary” (238). The data suggests that “For small changes in time (e.g. plus 5 percent)” (239) to reach a facility, demand decreases by around 7-11% depending on the sport (6.7% for basketball, 7.7% for swimming, up to 10.6% for handball). The authors examined willingness to travel to access sports facilities and found mean distances of around 7 km for basketball facilities, around 8 km for tennis facilities, and around 5.7 km for swimming facilities. Users reported willingness to travel further to access handball (14 km) and volleyball (10 km) facilities (239).

The article suggests that centralizing certain sports facilities (e.g. “basketball, soccer, tennis and swimming” (240)) may produce greater efficiencies/participation, whereas decentralizing other facilities (e.g. handball, volleyball) may be more appropriate given user willingness to travel further to reach these destinations.


Quotes/Highlights
• “A survey conducted by the Strategy Institute on behalf of the East Bay Regional Park District estimated that 10-20 miles was the distance residents were willing to drive for beach-based recreation activities” (120)


There is lack of consensus within the literature to what extent distance to facilities affects participation, but there is recognition that effects vary based on geography and sport type. In general, distance likely negatively affects sports participation frequency, but this is more acutely observed within certain sports over other, for example, swimming.

Quotes/Highlights
• “the literature suggests that travel distance to sports facilities may affect sports participation, but the extent to which this is the case seems to vary significantly between geographical settings and types of sports” 241
• “Travelling longer distances translates into experiencing accessibility constraints to a higher degree and that this occurs for relatively short distances.” 255
• “found that travel distance to sports facilities also negatively affected sports frequency, compared to participants using public space.” 257

Quotes/Highlights

• “the geography of sport is not only about where sport venue built-forms are located, but also what types of sport infrastructure are available…it is important to assess the capacity and quality of the sportscape along with other supporting structures and facilitators.” 291

• “not all swimming pool facilities are the same (i.e., they can range from low to high order goods), they can differ in terms of single or multi-sport facilities, the number and type of pools, depths and dimensions…these factors could impact the attractiveness of the facility and therefore the range and threshold of on-going activities.” 292

• “The ‘build it and they will come approach’ underlies much of the sport participation debate and politics surrounding sport facility provision.” 294

• “Distance decay is a term used to describe the probability of interaction between a demand point and supply point as a function of the distance between the two points…In a sport facilities context, the greater the distance, and therefore cost (i.e., travel time, monetary cost of travel) between a household and the facility, the less likely that the household will use the facility” 294

• “In a sport facility context, central place theory can be used to account for (i) the range – the maximum distance a given participant is willing to travel to a sport facility…and (ii) the threshold – minimum number of participants needed in order to offer services at the facility” 294

• “This combination of range and threshold can then be used to explain the development of major multi-sport facilities serving regional markets (large range and threshold) compared to single sport facilities (e.g., a local ice rink) serving a local neighborhood (small range and threshold). The threshold can be further conceptualized as either the entire population (e.g., family multi-sport market) or specific target populations (e.g., single ‘niche’ sport market).” 294

• Other important factors to consider: “quality/state of the infrastructure, distance decay, within/outside a sport club setting…city size…perceived versus actual distance…availability of sport facilities…gender…and school location” 295

• “the relationship between the existence of sport facilities and sport participation is not simple, straightforward or direct…need to better understand how [to] utilize geographical notions of distance decay, range, and threshold to better understand the nature of sport engagement” 296

• Identifies that youth divers in the GTA travel an average of 27 km to access a facility, reaching upwards of 80 km in some instances.

Quotes/Highlights

• “in the case of tennis courts, children’s club participation only starts decreasing when the distance exceeds 4 km, and in the case of indoor pools only at a distance of 6 km and more”

• “children that have a gym close by [that is, within 2.5 km] are more likely to join a sports club...average impact amounts to 13 percentage points”

• “differences in distances to facilities do not matter much in larger cities, which is probably not surprising given the high density of facilities in such locations. However, in smaller cities and villages, they matter substantially. Moving closer to a facility may easily increase a child’s likelihood to participate in some sports (organized by a sports club) by more than 10 percentage points.”

• Examined children between the ages of 3 and 10 in Germany and relationship between distance children and gym spaces, sports grounds, tennis courts and indoor pools.


This study examined adolescent perceptions of access to parks and physical activity facilities within their neighbourhood, objective accessibility to such amenities based on a 1500m radius from home locations and resulting impacts on physical activity levels. The authors find that adolescent perceptions of availability of physical activity facilities is more strongly linked to increased levels of physical activity than actual, objective availability of such facilities. This suggests that perception and individual motivation are potentially more important than physical accessibility to facilities, at least within a 1.5km radius from individuals’ homes.


Study surveyed 1200 users of forest users in Denmark to determine degree of willingness to travel to less crowded forested areas for recreational activities. The study finds that certain population groups (i.e. mountain bikers, horse riders, the elderly) are willing to travel an additional 4 km to access forests they perceive to be less busy, in addition to the base preferred distance of 6 km.

Examining accessibility to popular water environments in Helsinki, this study reveals that individuals are willing to travel further (1.7km, 24 minutes on foot, median measures) to access water environments for recreation than is generally assumed to be standard distance thresholds for green spaces within the literature (300- to 400m walking). This finding may also support the notion that different recreational amenities have different time/distance thresholds. However, user preferences/perceived barriers were not elaborated upon in-text, leaving a gap in terms of other factors impacting willingness to travel to access amenities.

As transportation mode intensity increases (e.g. cycling, transit, car), distances individuals are willing travel to access water environments also increases. However, travel times associated with certain modes (i.e. transit) are significantly higher than other modes. In this study, individuals would travel approximately 13 km (27 mins) via car, 10 km (54 minutes) via transit, and 4 km (15 minutes) via bicycle to access water environments.

Quotes/Highlights

• Study examines distances/durations individuals travel via multiple modes of transportation to access water environments in metro Helsinki, Finland, exploring thresholds that account for transportation networks, land uses and “requirements and preferences of individuals and their capacity to access and participate” (93)

• Finds that walking is the most common mode people surveyed used to access water sites in Helsinki, travelling approximately 1.7km (median) or 24 minutes to reach sites. This distance is significantly longer than the 300- to 400-m distance threshold often identified within literature examining accessibility of urban parks.

• Median travel distances and times increase by transportation mode: 4.1 km and 15 minutes for cycling, 9.8 km and 54 minutes for public transportation, and 12.9 km and 27 minutes for car.

• Utilizes public-participatory geographic information systems technology to collect user data and conduct accessibility analyses – provides access to individual requirements and preferences, in addition to more straightforward physical distances/networks

• Randomly sampled 30,000 residents of Helsinki, asking them to identify water locations they use and what sorts of activities they participated in at those location; also asked how they accessed those places (e.g. car, public transit), which places were particularly important to them, which places they felt were ‘inaccessible’ and preferences for future land uses along shore areas

• Walking the most common mode to access the water, with respondents traveling approximately 1.7km on average to do so; cars the second most popular transportation mode, making most popular water amenities accessible to participants within the area.

• Found that most popular water areas were accessible via car with a median time of 27 minutes, or, 54 minutes via public transit; 15 minutes on average via bicycle

• The study suggests that users are willing to travel much further than 300- to 400-m (often identified as a walking distance threshold to access sites such as parks) to access water environments, suggesting that different recreational amenities have different time/distance thresholds.

• Study does not go into detail on what some of the preferences or perceived barriers that individuals face that may also affect willingness to travel.

This study presents the findings of a secondary analysis of data from Western Australian adults, examining variables associated with different distances individuals travel to recreation destinations. The study finds that the mean distance individuals travelled to reach a recreational destination (i.e. rec. centre, beaches/rivers, parks) was around 5.5 km, +/- around 5.2 km. Younger adults travelled further to access beaches and rivers than older adults (7.3 km vs 6.0 km), individuals in socio-economically lower areas travel further than those in more affluent areas (8.1 km vs 7.3 km) and members of clubs travel further than non-members to use parks or ovals (4.2 km vs. 3.4 km).

Some work within physical activity studies “has defined neighborhood boundaries as geographical areas of 400-1000 m from respondent’s homes representing the distance individuals are likely or willing to walk” (p.8). This study suggests that individuals often travel much further outside the neighbourhood boundary to access physical activity amenities.

Quotes/Highlights

• “Our own data suggest use of public open space is sensitive to distance from home, but that adults are willing to travel further to use other recreational facilities used for vigorous activities and team sport (e.g., beaches, formal recreational facilities.” (p.2)

• “some evidence suggests travel distances may vary according to the type of activity, rather than the type of facility.” (p.2)

• “trip making (i.e., travel distance, time, and mode) as a function of money or time cost of travel, individual income, socio-demographic characteristics and built environmental characteristics.” (p.2)

• “Hanson and Hanson found that men visited recreational destinations that were on average 1.3 kilometres further away than those visited by women. Bagley and Moktarian, not considering the destination type used, reported that men traveled further compared with women regardless of mode (walking/cycling, transit, and vehicle).” (p.2)

• “Having limited opportunities available in their immediate areas may force people to travel outside their neighbourhoods.” (p.2)

• “The desire to undertake an activity combined with demographic attributes of the traveler might be sufficient to overcome distance such that an individual is prepared to use destinations outside their local neighborhood.” (p.2)

• “Information about how far people are willing to travel to use destinations for different types of physical activity behaviors, and whether demographic characteristics are associated with travel distance to specific recreational facilities is limited.” (p.3)

• Used GIS to conduct a road network analysis of destinations/user origin points.

• Total of 1006 survey respondents. Just over 56% of respondents reported visiting a formal recreation centre, 40% visited a beach or river, and 39% visited a park or oval.

• Mean number of formal destinations within a respondents’ neighbourhood was 2.47, 0.65 for beaches and river opportunities and 4.93 for parks/ovals. Mean distance to all destinations was 5.5 km.

• Respondents that travelled to reach a formal recreational facility travelled between 4.1 km to 6.3 km depending on intensity of activity (i.e. moderate versus vigorous; respondents report travelling further to engage in moderate physical activities at recreational facilities.)

  » “for each additional formal recreational facility located in a respondent’s neighborhood, the distance reduced by [approximately 500m] between the respondent’s household and the formal recreational facility used for physical activity.” (p.5)

  » Defines “formal facilities” as health clubs, rec/leisure centres, swimming pools, halls, gymnasiums and sports stadiums (p.4)
• “physical activity behavior undertaken at a destination was consistently associated with the distances respondents were prepared to travel, regardless of the type of facility” (p.7)

• “Those who participated in vigorous physical activity generally traveled further than non-vigorous exercisers to use the same type of destination (i.e. to use parks and ovals, and beaches and rivers)” (p.7)

• “Moreover, travel distances decreased as a function of the number of destinations available within the respondent’s neighbourhood regardless of the type of destination examined.” (p.7)

• “Younger adults, those with a higher income and those from socio-economically disadvantaged areas also tended to travel further to use recreational physical activity destinations.” (p.7)

• “the purpose for which a recreational destination is used (i.e., for walking, vigorous, moderate, other activity and multiple activities) may influence preparedness to travel, more so than the type of destination.” (p.7)

• “respondents who used destinations in this study had many destinations closer to their home than those they actually used…because of personal preferences, individuals may access recreational destinations further from home…many people perceived less proximate destinations to be more convenient” (p.7) – many factors explain, including lack of knowledge of alternatives, convenience of location to accomplish multiple errands with minimal travel, etc.

• “local neighbourhood parks and ovals generally only attract users from local surrounding areas, whereas regional and district parks and ovals attract patrons from a larger hinterland.” (p.7)

• “Lobo who reported that people travel further than their local neighborhoods to use indoor sports and tennis facilities. Moreover, as our group reported previously use of some facilities (e.g., sporting and recreational centres, and gyms/health clubs and exercise centres) appears to be less sensitive to distance than use of other types of facilities such as public open space, rivers, tennis courts and beaches.” (p.8)

• “The spatial distribution of homes, recreational destinations, and demographic groups are likely to differ between cities and hence influence generalizability. Thus, the findings from this study may not be transferable to other spatial settings or physical environments. Also noteworthy is that people may make decisions about whether to use a destination based on information other than proximity” (p.8) – limitations of study

  » Quality of facility/amenity also influences willingness to travel to destinations, but was not measured within this study

• “simply adding more recreational facilities to neighborhoods without considering other built environmental factors (i.e., population density, connectivity) and the possible trade-offs (e.g., potential loss and fragmentation of residential land), may not have the desired affect on travel or physical activity behavior.” (p.9)

- “Bandura argues that when environmental attributes exercise powerful constraints on behavior, they emerge as the over-riding determinants. Environmental attributes, in the case of physical activity, may be particularly influential.” (188)
- “A central focus of ecologic models is the role of the physical environment, recognizing that environments themselves and people’s behavior within them are shaped by social and organizational influences.” (189)
- “Booth et al. found accessibility of local facilities to be positively associated with older adults being categorized as sufficiently physically active in their leisure time for health benefits...reported access to a park and perceiving footpaths as safe for walking were significantly associated with being categorized as sufficiently physically active for health benefits” (190)
Joe Chirico  
General Manager of Community Services  
Regional District of Central Kootenay  
Suite 101, 333 Victoria St, Nelson, BC  
Box 590, 202 Lakeside Drive, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone: (250) 352-8158  Fax: (250) 352-9300  

October 28, 2019  

RE: CAMPBELL FIELD FEASIBILITY SERVICES  

Joe,  

Thank you for the opportunity to provide further assistance as the RDCK and others continue to work towards a potential recreation amenity development project at Campbell Field.  

We have developed the following work plan based on our understanding of the situation and previous discussions. We expect that this work will build upon the partnership discussions we have been a part of and the other plans we have worked on for the RDCK and more specifically Area H.  

As per our last meeting on October 24, 2019, we expect that our work plan will help achieve the following planning conditions as outlined in the Area H Master Plan and presented to all potential partners that evening:  

Stage 1: Confirming needs  
- There must be public engagement in the planning process, preferably through the use of statistically reliable surveys.  
- A market assessment for component service delivery functions must be completed.  
- The project must demonstrate conformance to the broader regional/municipal strategic planning.  

Stage 2: Analyzing costs and benefits  
- Business planning outlining capital partners, operating partners, sources of capital, capital amortization, and projection of operating costs must be completed.  
- There must be a concept development plan including infrastructure planning, costs, and impacts of ongoing operations.  

In order to assist us with this exercise, we will need an architect to help. We can identify an architect independently or with your help, but know that we have allocated funding to get further capital costing and floors plans / renderings as part of the process.  

We also expect to work with RDCK staff collaboratively to develop expected annual operating cost estimates and gather relevant planning documentation and market data.  

Although we expect the project and reporting to evolve, the following work plan outlines tasks associated with achieving this end. We expect that all work can be completed during 2020 but will remain flexible as to alternate timelines if need be.  

Note that “Other services” includes the development of a teaser video to explain the overall planning process to interested parties. **Also important to note is the costs associated with the distribution of the surveys (postage, printing, etc.) and the costs associated with venue rental for engagement purposes have been excluded and are assumed to be the responsibility of the RDCK.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RCS + PERC Hours</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Other (design, research)</th>
<th>Other services</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Confirming needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary facility program options</td>
<td>Confirmation of what types of spaces (program options) could be included in the feasibility exploration, considering existing planning documentation from all parties and administrative input.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background information</td>
<td>More work on taking the information gathered in the first phases of the conversation to provide more detailed market data around facility program options.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility inventory and mapping</td>
<td>Review and analysis of recreation facilities and spaces in the market area.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project teaser video</td>
<td>Development of a short 1-2min video to explain the planning process and who is involved.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household survey (web and hard copy)</td>
<td>Web based, controlled access (post cards, supplemented by hard copy mail for those that prefer) survey of RDCK Area and City households to determine general public support for, travel distance thresholds, and potential use of, new facilities and spaces at Campbell Field (as defined through the preliminary program options)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open online survey</td>
<td>An online, open version of the household survey provided for those who don't get a code (renters, etc.).</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student survey</td>
<td>Survey of students, and potential families, affiliated with the Campbell Field area in regards to desires, travel patterns, and potential use.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group survey</td>
<td>Online survey of potential user groups to gauge interest in potential spaces (as per the program options - focused) related to potential use, willingness to pay, space details / requirements, potential partnerships, etc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews and meetings</td>
<td>Interviews and meetings (up to 20) with key stakeholders, including potential partners (non-profits, etc.), internal stakeholders, steering committee, etc.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we heard report</td>
<td>Compilation of all engagement efforts related to the potential facility in a stand alone document. Specific attention placed on how the engagement results support and impact the facility program options.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market research</td>
<td>Based on findings of what we heard, more detailed analysis of program elements in relation to existing inventories, life cycle of existing, utilization, demographics and population and trends.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility program</td>
<td>Presentation of suggested facility program based on what we heard and market research.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RCS + PERC Hours</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Other (design, research)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage #1 report: Confirming needs</td>
<td>Report back to Steering Committee to present suggested facility / space program for Campbell Field and to provide an option for partners to &quot;get off the bus&quot; at that stage.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 sub-total: hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 sub total: fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Analyzing costs and benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership models</td>
<td>Research and analysis into potential partnership models related to future development at Campbell Field based on the remaining partnership group.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor plans and images</td>
<td>Preparation of concept floor plans and renderings based on Stage 1 facility program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital cost analysis (+/- 25%)</td>
<td>Capital cost analysis of facility program (assumes costing completed by an architecture firm, not a cost consultant; +/-25%).</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost analysis (+/- 25%)</td>
<td>Operating cost analysis of program options (assumes collaboration with RDCK staff).</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 report: Analyzing costs and benefits</td>
<td>Stage 2 report outlining findings of Stage 1, floor plans and capital and operating costs of facility program and recommended (or potential options related to) ownership and operating models based on all information to date.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 sub-total: hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: sub-total: fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,650</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 and Stage 2 total hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 and 2 total fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,050</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$12,400</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$49,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursements and administration (12%) $5,958

Total project upset (excluding GST and technical site assessment) $55,608

I hope that this provides enough information for you to move forward. If you require further clarification or would like to discuss, please do not hesitate to call. Should our approach not meet your expectations, we would be more than willing to adjust our work plan to better meet your needs.

Regards,

Michael Roma
RC Strategies+PERC
2004 Sherwood Drive
Sherwood Park, Alberta
Canada, T8A 0Z1
P: (708) 441 – 4263
E: roma@rcstrategies.ca
January __, 2020

John Hawkings, Director
Recreation Sites & Trail BC
PO Box 9811 STN PROV GOV
Victoria, BC
V8W 9W1

Dear Mr. Hawkings,

RE: COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RAIL TRAIL

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your letter dated July 26, 2019 which identifies trail management challenges and explains the proposal to cancel the recreation trail designation on a portion of the Columbia & Western Rail Trail.

It is our understanding that the rail trail route crosses a portion of “Electoral Area J” in the Regional District of Central Kootenay which is subject to the Castlegar and District Recreation Commission 2016 Recreation & Culture Master Plan. The intent of this Plan is to guide decision making with regards to future recreation and culture facilities and services provided by the Castlegar and District Recreation Commission via the Regional District of Central Kootenay.

The Plan is based upon a comprehensive program of research including thorough public and stakeholder consultation and with consideration of stakeholders, including regional partners, other levels of government, local non-profit volunteer groups, and the private sector. The Castlegar and District Recreation Commission would recommend the same process of meaningful collaboration with all stakeholders is undertaken when developing the plan for the Columbia and Western Rail Trail as it was with the development of the Master Plan. The District understands and can appreciate the varied and specific interests of all stakeholders involved in the process.

When considering your decision please review this valid and agreed upon Plan which can be downloaded from: https://rdck.ca/assets/Administration/Documents/2016-02-05%20Castlegar%20Master%20Plan%20FINAL.pdf

Specifically the plan speaks to the following points in regard to Trail development under the jurisdiction of the RDCK:

The master plan identifies that trails and pathways are the No. 1 community priority (mentioned by 49% of residents as a priority, mentioned by 40% of local groups as a priority). The master plan also identifies that the provision of trails as a recreational amenity is currently trending.

The master plan also identifies that ATV/dirt Bike Trails are the No. 5 community priority (mentioned by 11% of residents as a priority). The master plan also identifies that this amenity type is not mentioned by local groups as a priority and that no sanctioned trails are provided in the area. In regards to the future needs and considerations for ATV/Dirt Bike Trails the master provides directions to the CDRC as follows:

- Do not incorporate into existing or new regional, community or neighborhood parks
- Provision of activity should be contingent upon the involvement of key stakeholders groups and the province.
Thank you for considering the Regional District’s interests.

Sincerely,

Aimee Watson,
Board Chair, Regional District of Central Kootenay

Cc: Stuart Horn, Chief Administrative Officer
    Bergen Price, Chair Castlegar & District Community Complex Recreation Commission
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to rescind Regional Board Resolutions 832/19 and 833/19. A time frame is required to be included in the board resolution as per the Community Charter legislation regarding the Remedial Action Requirement for the property owner to achieve compliance by removing all offending matter including household waste and garbage on an unsightly property legally described as: Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Mr. Desmond L. Penny is the registered property owner of the legally described property above, located at 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC, in Electoral Area F of the RDCK and in the service area of the RDCK Unsightly Property Bylaw No. 1687, 2004 regulations.

On November 21, 2019, the Regional Board passed Resolution 832/19 authorizing Bylaw Enforcement to enter onto the property located at 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC and legally described as: Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District, with a contractor to remove all offending matter with all cost incurred by the RDCK being billed to the owner of the property, identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny.

On November 21, 2019, the Regional board passed Resolution 833/19 for all cost incurred by the RDCK be added to the property taxes as taxes in arrears should the property owner identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny not pay the bill by December 31st of the year the clean up occurred on 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC and legally described as: Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District.

After November 21, 2019, Bylaw Enforcement Officer Pamela Guille, while preparing notification to Mr. Desmond Penny, noted that under the Community Charter Section 76, the time limit requirement for compliance was not met. Under Section 76 Subsection (1) of the Community Charter, the Regional Board must specify the time by which the required action must be completed and Subsection (2) states that is must not be less than 30 days after notice is sent to the person subject to the remedial action requirement.

SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan: □ YES ☒ NO</th>
<th>Financial Plan Amendment: □ YES ☒ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required: □ YES ☒ NO</td>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’ed: □ YES ☒ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):
RDCK Unsightly Property Bylaw No. 1687, 2004

Regional Board Policy #IC 105/98 Unsightly Property Violations

Community Charter – Division 12, Section 76

c. Environmental Considerations:
The abundance of garbage and household waste is a significant animal attractant for a variety of wildlife which is creating a situation for human/animal conflict. In addition, the variety of animal attractants and presence of vermin etc. presents public health and safety concerns for the citizens of this neighborhood and surrounding area.

d. Social Considerations:
Continued non-compliance may encourage other persons in the community to allow their properties to accumulate garbage and/or an assortment of disused items in contravention of the bylaw.

e. Economic Considerations:
N/A

f. Communication Considerations:
N/A

g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:
Staff time would be required on site and under a warrant, to direct contractors in removing the unsightly materials. The duration would be dependant on the amount of materials needed to be removed.

h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:
N/A

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS
N/A

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
1) That the Regional Board rescind Resolutions 832/19 and 833/19.

2) That the Regional Board order Mr. Desmond L. Penny to meet compliance with the Unsightly Property Bylaw No. 1687, 2004 within sixty (60) days; and that, if the work is not completed within the sixty (60) day timeline, the Board authorize Bylaw Enforcement to enter onto the property located at 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC and legally described as: Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District, with a contractor to remove all offending matter with all cost incurred by the RDCK being billed to the owner of the property, identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny.

3) That the Board approve all cost incurred by the RDCK be added to the property taxes as taxes in arrears should the property owner identified as Mr. Desmond L. Penny not pay the bill by
December 31st of the year the clean up occurred on 4856 Bain Road, Beasley, BC and legally described as: Lot 13, Plan NEP955, District Lot 7067, Kootenay Land District; and further, that all costs be charged to S288 Untidy and Unsiightly Properties, Electoral Area F.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature: [Signature]

Name: Pamela Guille

CONCURRENCE

Chief Administrative Officer
General Manager of Development Services

Initials:

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Community Charter – Division 12, Section 76
Division 12 — Remedial Action Requirements

Council may impose remedial action requirements

72 (1) A council may impose remedial action requirements in relation to
(a) matters or things referred to in section 73 [hazardous conditions],
(b) matters or things referred to in section 74 [declared nuisances], or
(c) circumstances referred to in section 75 [harm to drainage or dike].

(2) In the case of matters or things referred to in section 73 or 74, a remedial action requirement
(a) may be imposed on one or more of
(i) the owner or lessee of the matter or thing, and
(ii) the owner or occupier of the land on which it is located, and
(b) may require the person to
(i) remove or demolish the matter or thing,
(ii) fill it in, cover it over or alter it,
(iii) bring it up to a standard specified by bylaw, or
(iv) otherwise deal with it in accordance with the directions of council or a person authorized by council.

(3) In the case of circumstances referred to in section 75, a remedial action requirement
(a) may be imposed on the person referred to in that section, and
(b) may require the person to undertake restoration work in accordance with the directions of council or a person authorized by council.

Hazardous conditions

73 (1) Subject to subsection (2), a council may impose a remedial action requirement in relation to any of the following:
(a) a building or other structure, an erection of any kind, or a similar matter or thing;
(b) a natural or artificial opening in the ground, or a similar matter or thing;
(c) a tree;
(d) wires, cables, or similar matters or things, that are on, in, over, under or along a highway;
(e) matters or things that are attached to a structure, erection or other matter or thing referred to in paragraph (a) that is on, in, over, under or along a highway.

(2) A council may only impose the remedial action requirement if
(a) the council considers that the matter or thing is in or creates an unsafe condition, or
(b) the matter or thing contravenes the Provincial building regulations or a bylaw under section 8 (3) (l) [spheres of authority — buildings and other structures] or Division 8 [Building Regulation] of this Part.

Declared nuisances

74 (1) A council may declare that any of the following is a nuisance and may impose a remedial action requirement in relation to the declared nuisance:

(a) a building or other structure, an erection of any kind, or a similar matter or thing;
(b) a natural or artificial opening in the ground, or a similar matter or thing;
(c) a drain, ditch, watercourse, pond, surface water, or a similar matter or thing;
(d) a matter or thing that is in or about any matter or thing referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c).

(2) Subsection (1) also applies in relation to a thing that council considers is so dilapidated or unclean as to be offensive to the community.

Harm to drainage or dike

75 A council may impose a remedial action requirement if a person has

(a) obstructed, filled up or damaged a ditch, drain, creek or watercourse that was constructed or improved under this Act or the Local Government Act, or
(b) damaged or destroyed a dike or other drainage or reclamation work connected with it.

Time limit for compliance

76 (1) The resolution imposing a remedial action requirement must specify the time by which the required action must be completed.

(2) Subject to section 79 [shorter time limits in urgent circumstances], the time specified under subsection (1) must not be earlier than 30 days after notice under section 77 (1) [notice to affected persons] is sent to the person subject to the remedial action requirement.

(3) The council may extend the time for completing the required action even though the time limit previously established has expired.
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Board Report

Date of Report: December 16, 2019
Date & Type of Meeting: January 16, 2020 Open Regular Board Meeting
Author: Steve Ethier, Water Operations Manager
Subject: LINEAR INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRUCTION CREW EVALUATION
File: 11-5700-30-STUDIES_REPORTS

SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present to the Board of Directors the results from a cost comparison and seek Board approval for the formation of an in-house capital works linear assets (water distribution pipe) construction crew and to include the costs to establish a construction crew in the 2021 Financial Plan since the result of the cost comparison shows potential cost savings of $142,800 per year in labour, and equipment cost based on a 200 day construction season and 5-40% in material cost.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The RDCK Water Operations Department operates 20 independently funded water services, and 1 stormwater drainage system. In total, the RDCK operates 136.2 km of water distribution network, 20 reservoirs, 9 wells, 6 pressure reducing stations, 15 surface water intake structures, 9 water treatment plants, and 5 chlorination stations.

An Asset Management Plan (AMP) was commissioned in 2015 and has been updated annually. The AMP helps to determine and prioritize system resourcing and reserve contribution requirements. With this insight it has been determined that almost all RDCK water systems are running significant infrastructure deficits and require large amounts of asset replacement.

Several projects are underway to address these infrastructure replacement needs. The draft utilities capital plan for the period of 2020 to 2024 identifies 22 pipe replacement projects (12.5 km of pipe) with an estimated cost of $5,720,000 as well as other projects like metering programs and valve replacement programs at an estimated cost of $3,650,000 that may be assisted by internal forces.

In recent tendering processes it was apparent that many water system projects, with budgeted cost in line with project cost from 2010 to 2015, are severely underfunded when comparing the budget to the tenders received. This cost inflation triggered the need for staff to evaluate and implement other options for project delivery including significant benefit realized through the RDCK negotiated RFP process. Other projects delivered historically in-house, like the first and third phases of main line replacement in Arrow/Erickson, provide strong indications about the cost effectiveness of project delivery in that form.

Board Resolution #789/19 states:

“That the Board direct Staff to investigate the feasibility of and the cost impacts on RDCK owned water systems and the RDCK as a whole from the hiring of an in-house capital works linear assets (water distribution pipe) construction crew and bring back a report to the January 2020 Board of Directors meeting.”
This evaluation focuses on three options for future linear infrastructure replacement small project delivery.

- **Option 1**: formation of an equipped construction crew with three operators, excavator and all associated equipment.
- **Option 2**: a two person crew, contracted excavation and all associated equipment.
- **Option 3**: status quo, tendered contract construction as the only project delivery method.

Large and complex projects will continue to be delivered through outside contractors using RFP/RFQ or negotiated RFP processes under all options.

Options 1 and 2 includes associated costs within the rest of the organization (finance, admin, work stations and vehicle and material storage, supervision, insurance, etc.). It does not take into account room and board as it would be required for all three options.

**Option #1:**

- The formation of an equipped construction crew with a site superintendent, labourer, excavator, equipment operator, portable office, and all associated equipment. See Attachment 1 for equipment list break down, annual contribution for replacement, and annual maintenance cost.
- The initial capital start up cost would be approximately $380,100 with an annual contribution to reserve of $45,662, and annual equipment maintenance cost of $32,200.
- When breaking this down into a day rate, assuming a 200 day work season the RDCK would realize an estimated annual savings of $142,800 (additional savings are expected to be obtained from the built in contingency, saved cost on internal project managers time and reduced material cost). See tables 1.0 and 1.1 below for day rates. Day rates include all cost mentioned above plus labour.
- Disbursement cost have not been considered in this option because they have been assumed to be equal to disbursement cost of a contractor.
- See Attachment 1 for full break down; equipment, labour including overtime, annual reserve contributions and annual maintenance cost, administrative overhead and substantial contingency.

**Option #2:**

- Compare the cost of a two person RDCK crew and contracted excavation. The two person RDCK crew would be made up of a Site Superintendent, Labour and all associated equipment required for a two person crew, does not include excavator and excavator operator.
- The initial capital start up cost would be approximately $144,590 with an annual contribution to reserve of $18078, and annual equipment maintenance cost of $10,300. When breaking this down into a day rate, assuming a 200 day work season the RDCK would realize an annual savings of $69,400. See tables 1.0 and 2.0 below for day rates.
- Disbursement cost (stipend) have not been considered in this option because they would be equal to disbursement cost of a contractor.
- See Attachment 1 for full break down; equipment, labour including overtime, annual reserve contributions and annual maintenance cost, administrative overhead and substantial contingency.
**Option #3:**
- Continue with status quo for smaller to mid sized project by proceeding with the tendering process or standing offers with contractors. In recent tendering processes it was apparent that many water system projects, with budgeted cost in line with project cost from 2010 to 2015, are severely underfunded when comparing the budget to the tenders received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL CONTRACTOR LABOUR RATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer/Helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Size Excavator &amp; operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Day Rate:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual (200 day construction season):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RDCK LABOUR RATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer/Helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment base rate (See Attachment 1 equipment list)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support 20%: (RDCK Labour and Equipment only):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency 15%: (RDCK Labour, Equipment and Admin):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Day Rate:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual (200 day construction season):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administrative cost would include 0.4 FTE of admin staff time, IT charges, HR, Finance, Health and Safety, and overtime.
Table 2.0
RDCK LABOUR and Contracted Equipment with Operator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily (8hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Superintendent</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer/helper</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Equipment base rate (see Attachment 2)</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Size Excavator &amp; operator</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support 20%: (RDCK Labour and Equipment only)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$165</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency 15%: (RDCK Labour, Equipment and Admin)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$149</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Day Rate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2333</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual (200 day construction season):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$466,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.0
RDCK Material Cost vs Contractor Cost*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RDCK</th>
<th>Contractor 5%</th>
<th>Contractor 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C900 200 mm pipe DR18</td>
<td>$89.81</td>
<td>$94.30</td>
<td>$125.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 mm AWWA gate valve</td>
<td>$2656.56</td>
<td>$2289.39</td>
<td>$3719.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C900 150 mm pipe DR18</td>
<td>$52.68</td>
<td>$55.31</td>
<td>$73.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 mm AWWA gate valve</td>
<td>$1539.23</td>
<td>$1616.19</td>
<td>$2154.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material costing ranges from a 5%-40% mark up when compared to RDCK material pricing.

*Cost are based on single unit cost. Typical small to medium projects would include 50-200 meters of pipe and several isolation gate valves within one project.

Through this evaluation it has been made apparent that Option 1, with an initial investment of $380,100 (includes interest on 5 year loan) for equipment procurement, the RDCK could save $142,800 annually. This savings is based on the comparison of a three person RDCK construction crew day rate, which includes all necessary equipment, to current contracted rates. Additional savings would be realized through internal project materials purchasing, and project management site inspections performed by the construction crew rather than the need to hire a dedicated site inspector.

See Attachment 1 for full RDCK crew labour and equipment break down.
SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

| Included in Financial Plan: | □ YES | ☒ NO | Financial Plan Amendment: | □ YES | ☒ NO |
| Debt Bylaw Required:        | □ YES | ☒ NO | Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d: | □ YES | ☒ NO |

The initial capital investment for options 1 and 2 would be funded through short term borrowing. It is proposed that all cost be included in the financial plan in the form of an Allocation Service similar to the current project management service A112. This allocation service would be funded fully by contributions from the capital projects.

b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):

Failing linear infrastructure (water pipe in the ground) poses a risk to health and environment, the RDCK’s ability to maintain compliance as well as large liability in regards to potential property damages and business losses.

c. Environmental Considerations:

Failing linear infrastructure can create erosion issues damaging creeks, rivers, roads, and property.

d. Social Considerations:

Failing linear infrastructure (water pipe in the ground) poses a risk to health and environment and the RDCK’s ability to maintain uninterrupted services to our customers. Reliable water systems give piece of mind to our residents.

e. Economic Considerations:

With the infrastructure deficits our water systems are facing, along with the limited funds, this is an attempt to find alternatives that allow to close the gap between infrastructure needs and the difficult financial situation of many of our water systems. In the last few years the RDCK had to repeatedly reject tenders and cancel projects leading to financial loss from consultant and project manager time on the tender process. Recent attempts to secure grant funding for distribution system replacements have been unsuccessful and discussions with ministerial staff leave us with little hope for success within current grant programs for this type of projects.

f. Communication Considerations:

N/A

g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:

A portable on site construction office is considered in the day rates in Table 1.1 and Table 2.0 and will have full wifi access to the RDCK network through the RDCK’s Citrix remote desktop. A laptop will also be available in the Water Operations Manager’s office in the event work is required in the head office.

h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:

*Water Protection & Advocacy* and *Coordinated Service Delivery* are Board Priorities.
SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

Option #1: That staff be directed to establish an equipped construction crew including hiring of a site superintendent, labourer and equipment operator, and purchasing of an excavator service trucks, portable office, and all associated equipment with a capital budget not to exceed $355,100 in 2021 and further that a dedicated allocation service be included in the 2021 financial plan

PROS:
- Estimated annual savings for water systems on capital projects of $142,800. The RDCK would have more control over project rollout.
- All construction materials would cost 5%-40% less, see Table 3.0. This markup is based on past projects.
- Allow projects to accurately differentiate operational staff time from capital works staff time. Currently operations staff time, from the operations/maintenance budgets, are subsidising portions of capital projects making it difficult to account for the true cost of assets and in several cases causing operation/maintenance salary overages.
- Current community works guidelines do not allow for funds to cover operational staff time. By having a dedicated construction crew, the time invested in the project by the construction crew would be a part of the asset and therefore covered by community works funding.
- In emergency situations and down time, this crew can assist operation’s operators with repairs and perform investigative work for future linear projects.
- A reduction in contract administration cost.

CONS:
- The RDCK would be responsible for all equipment maintenance.
- Staff and equipment would still need to be maintained and paid for during equipment breakdowns.
- The initial start up of the construction crew will carry an initial capital investment as mentioned in Option 1’s description.
- Larger risk with initial capital (set-up cost) investment.

Option #2: That staff be directed to establish an equipped construction crew including hiring of a site superintendent, labourer and equipment operator, and purchasing of a portable office, a service truck and all associated equipment with a capital budget not to exceed $135,590 in 2021 and further that a dedicated allocation service be included in the 2021 financial plan

PROS:
- The RDCK would have more control over project rollout.
- Allows the RDCK to source equipment and operators based on the location of the project.
- Allows the RDCK to source the appropriate size of equipment based on the type of project.
- Eliminates the need to maintain both budgetary and administratively the managing of heavy equipment compared to Option 1.
- A reduction in contract administration cost.
- Benefits small local contractors who do not typically bid on tendered projects.
• The RDCK has standing offers with several local contractors in various areas throughout the district at the rate outlined in Table 1.0.
• Current community works guidelines do not allow for funds to cover operational staff time. By having a dedicated construction crew, the time invested to the project by the construction crew would be a part of the asset and therefore covered by community works funding

CONS:
• Day rate is more expensive than Option 1.
• Still requires a contingency due to all the unexpected small equipment failures.

Option #3: That the RDCK continue with status quo for project delivery for smaller to mid sized projects by proceeding with contracted services only.

PROS:
• No equipment capital investment required.
• No annual maintenance cost.
• No added administrative support required.

CONS:
• Several bids received for recent small projects have come in well over budget largely based on high unit rates for labour, equipment and materials.
• The impact of cost escalations of the construction market will be more significant.
• Less control on timing of project rollout.
• Added contract administration when compared to options 1 and 2.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
That staff be directed to establish an equipped construction crew including hiring of a site superintendent, labourer and equipment operator, and purchasing of an excavator, service trucks, portable office, and all associated equipment with a capital budget not to exceed $355,100 in 2021 and further that a dedicated allocation service be included in the 2021 financial plan.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Name: Steve Ethier, Water Operations Manager

CONCURRENCE
Utility Services Manager
General Manager of Environmental Services
Chief Administrative Officer

Initials:

ATTACHMENTS: 2019-10-31_BrdRpt_Construction-Crew-Evaluation_Attachment-1
## Attachment 1

### CAP Crew Costing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Operator Time Commitment</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>Initial Start-up Cost</th>
<th>Life expectancy</th>
<th>Annual Reserve Contribution for Replacement</th>
<th>Annual Operations &amp; Maintenance Cost</th>
<th>Total Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined Space</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Trenching</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOD Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailgate Meetings Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined Space Program Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Procedure Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Toe boots</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloves</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coveralls</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High vis vest (cones vest)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High vis warm jacket</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain gear</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnesses</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash pumps</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator Cage</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamper</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19756</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid size track excavator, rubber tire</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle 1/2 ton or less</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5125</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable office, storage, bathroom</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel (1/2 ton, 1 ton, excavator)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chop saw</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrench set</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot tap</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Tools</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valve Wrenches</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shovels</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick shovel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road signage</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich boards</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cones</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilliteters</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Excavator</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter tires</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service box</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts stock</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingency

- 0.35 Benefits
- 0.14 Admin Supp
- 0.2

### Operational Costs

- Operations Maintenance annual: 32,209.00
- Operations Maintenance annual reserve: 45,682.67
- Loan Interest: 25,000.00
- Total: 102,882.67

### O&M Day Rate based on 260 day season

- 514.31

### Labour Rate

- 205,723.33
- Labour salary hourly rate: 30.00
- Benefits: 4.20
- Number of operators in crew: 4.00
- Site Superintendent hourly rate: 46.00
- Benefits: 5.60
- Number of Site Sups: 1.00
- Hours per day: 8.00
- Labour Day Rate: 912.00

### Day Rate (Operations + Equip):

- 1,426.31
- Admin Support: 285.26
- Total Day Rate: 1,711.58
- Contingency: 256.74

### Total Day Rate with Contingency:

- 1,968.31
### Attachment 2

| CAP Crew/Coating | Unit Cost | Number of Operators | Operator Time Commitment | Total Time | Initial Start-up Cost | Life expectancy | Replacement | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost | Total Annual Cost |
|------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                  |           |                     |                          |            |                      |                 |             | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost |                  |
| External Training |           |                     |                          |            |                      |                 |             | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost |                  |
| First Aid        | 135       | 2                   | 16                       | 32         | 270                 | 3               | 90          |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Confined Space   | 150       | 2                   | 8                        | 16         | 300                 | 3               | 300         |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Safe Trenching   | 135       | 2                   | 8                        | 16         | 270                 | 3               | 90          |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Internal Training|           |                     |                          |            |                      |                 |             | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost |                  |
| SCP Review       | 0         | 2                   | 8                        | 16         | 0                   | 1               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Tailgate meetings Review| 0| 2           | 0.5                      | 1          | 0                   | 1               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Confined Space Program Review| 0| 2           | 2                        | 4          | 0                   | 1               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Lockout Procedure Review| 0| 2           | 1                        | 2          | 0                   | 1               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| **Equipment**    |           |                     |                          |            |                      |                 |             | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost |                  |
| Steel toe boots | 250       | 2                   | 0                        | 550        | 1                   | 550             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Gloves           | 20        | 2                   | 0                        | 40         | 0.25                | 150             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Coveralls        | 200       | 2                   | 0                        | 400        | 0.5                 | 800             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| High vis vest (survey vest) | 70  | 2             | 0                        | 140        | 0.5                 | 280             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| High vis warm jacket | 150     | 2             | 0                        | 300        | 1                   | 300             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Rain gear        | 150       | 2                   | 2                        | 300        | 1                   | 300             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Harnesses        | 150       | 2                   | 0                        | 300        | 10                  | 300             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Trash cans       | 1100      | 2                   | 0                        | 2200       | 3                   | 440             | 100         |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Evacuation Cage  | 33000     | 2                   | 0                        | 22000      | 5                   | 22000           | 260         |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Tamper           | 0         | 1                   | 0                        | 0          | 5                   | 5               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Mid size track excavator, rubber tire | 0  | 1             | 0                        | 0          | 5                   | 5               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Trailer          | 0         | 1                   | 0                        | 0          | 30                  | 30              | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Vehicle 1/2 ton or less | 0   | 1             | 0                        | 0          | 8                   | 8               | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Vehicle (service truck) | 55000 | 1             | 0                        | 55000      | 8                   | 6800            | 1500        | 2333.333333 | 500             |                  |                  |                  |
| Portable office, storage, bathrooms | 35000 | 1             | 0                        | 35000      | 15                  | 2333.333333 | 500         |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Fuel (use service truck) | 30     | 200              | 0                        | 3000       | 0                   | 6000            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| **Tools**        |           |                     |                          |            |                      |                 |             | Annual Reserve | Contribution for | Annual Operations & | Maintenance Cost |                  |
| Vacuum           | 150       | 1                   | 0                        | 150        | 5                   | 150             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Chop saw         | 350       | 1                   | 0                        | 350        | 5                   | 350             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Wrench set       | 100       | 2                   | 0                        | 200        | 10                  | 200             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Hot tap          | 3200      | 1                   | 0                        | 3200       | 10                  | 3200            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Misc. Tools      | 1000       | 3                   | 0                        | 1000       | 5                   | 500             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Value Wrenches   | 100       | 2                   | 0                        | 200        | 10                  | 200             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Shovels          | 300       | 1                   | 0                        | 300        | 3                   | 300             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Pick shovel      | 60        | 2                   | 0                        | 60         | 5                   | 60              | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Road signpost    | 70        | 4                   | 0                        | 280        | 5                   | 280             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Sandwich boards  | 150       | 4                   | 0                        | 600        | 5                   | 600             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Cases            | 15        | 6                   | 0                        | 90         | 5                   | 90              | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Deliveries       | 45        | 6                   | 0                        | 540        | 5                   | 540             | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Metal Detector   | 760       | 3                   | 0                        | 2280       | 3                   | 2280            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Winter tires     | 580       | 1                   | 0                        | 2320       | 3                   | 773.333333      | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Service box      | 6800      | 1                   | 0                        | 6800       | 10                  | 6800            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Parking space    | 2000      | 1                   | 0                        | 2000       | 2                   | 2000            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Insurance        | 1800      | 1                   | 0                        | 1800       | 1                   | 1800            | 0           |                |                  |                  |                  |                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>0.15 Benefits</th>
<th>0.14 Admin Supp</th>
<th>0.2 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Maintenance annual</td>
<td>14,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Maintenance annual reserve</td>
<td>18,077.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Interest</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,777.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM Day rate based on 200-day season</td>
<td>958.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour salary hourly rate</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of operators in crew</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Superintendent hourly rate</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Site Sups</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per day</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Day Rate</td>
<td>618.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Rate (Operations + Equip)</td>
<td>825.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td>165.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Day Rate</td>
<td>999.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>144.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Day Rate with Contingency</td>
<td>1,144.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Equipment and Operator</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Day Rate 2 person ROCK + Contracted Equipment and Operator</td>
<td>2,318.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

302
Age-friendly Communities

2020 Application Form for Stream 1
Age-friendly Assessments, Action Plans & Planning

SECTION 1: Applicant Information

Regional District of Central Kootenay   Box 590, Nelson BC   V1L 5R4

Contact Person: Mike Morrison, Manager of Corporate Administration, 250-352-6665
mmorrison@rdck.bc.ca

SECTION 2: Project Information

Project Title: Moving Forward in Area A

Proposed start and end dates. Start: April 1, 2020   End: March 31, 2021

Total proposed project budget: $25,000
Total proposed grant request: $25,000

Proposed Focus Areas

The rural and remote communities of the East Shore/Wynndel (Area A) are envisioning a thriving, age friendly community where all of our residents have access to recreational opportunities, medical and health services, cultural events and social gatherings. Presently, this access is limited and each community is trying to do all of this on its own. Pooling our resources, skills and assets to ensure that our seniors and all residents have equal access would help our communities to thrive.

In order to thrive we need to assess each of our communities, what is working for them, where their challenges are and how we can work together to create action and ensure age friendly communities.

Area A of Regional District of Central Kootenay has an unusually high number of elder residents who live along a narrow winding highway 3A between Riondel in the north, through Kootenay Bay, Crawford Bay, Gray Creek, Boswell and Wynndel (Creston) to the south. None of these small communities are incorporated: the region relies on the efforts of our one elected Director on the RDCK board, and our local volunteer organizations.

In the past year, Area A residents invested personal funds to buy a community bus from the TAPS program in Creston. Most of the investors in the bus are seniors who understand the
urgent need for transportation services in isolated communities such as ours, where no taxis or public options exist. The investors group formed a new East Shore Transportation Society, which now offers bus services to seniors and other vulnerable residents to decrease social isolation and improve access to health, recreation, and other services.

Building on this local initiative, our project “Moving Forward in Area A” has a strong transportation focus, and will also address other key features/components of Age-friendly communities.

As the East Shore Transportation Society (ESTS) begins to provide services along Highway 3A (which is a critical link for Kootenay Pass on Highway 3 and the Kootenay Lake Ferry) the need for safety planning, active transit planning, and accessibility to transportation, recreation and health and wellness services have come into focus. Our residents, as well as our visitors, will benefit from the assessment and improvement of safe transportation services within the area. The east shore depends on tourism as our main industry and each year we have more bicycle tourist traffic coming through on the Selkirk Loop. Our younger seniors are active hikers and bikers, and we have had an increase in electric bikes on the highways and side roads. Coordination, culture, and convenience of the community bus and active transit are important topics for discussion with engaged Area A residents.

**Access to recreational activities** such as walking, hiking and biking, and **access to outdoor spaces** and parks such as the new Crawford Creek Park in Crawford Bay, can be made possible through the community bus. The community bus survey completed in June 2019 found that residents most value trips to the Recreation Centre in Creston and to Ainsworth Hotsprings. Now owned by the Lower Kootenay Band (Creston) Ainsworth is a popular wellness attraction for older residents in particular in the winter.

**Housing** for seniors is limited in our area to Bluebell Manor in Riondel. The community bus will make a stop, and seniors can contact the dispatcher for home pick-up and delivery. Riding the bus is itself an opportunity to bring older adults together with younger age groups, increase access to social/cultural/educational opportunities and enable greater inter-generational connections between community members. **Respect, social inclusion, and cultural safety** are all values that can be learned and expressed through the bus experience.

In the area of **social well-being and participation**, the bus will bring isolated older adults out to be more engaged and active in the community, and to have greater access to events and opportunities. The age-friendly assessment will encourage elder and senior residents to identify issues and opportunities, and find ways to use the bus and other resources to improve social inclusion, participation and well-being in our small, rural communities.

**The East Shore of Area A** is currently involved as a pilot community to develop an ElderConnect SmartHub which is a local online portal that is connected to the local volunteer network. This will serve as a key information source to promote and provide timely information about the bus, the schedule, activities, etc. There will be stories posted and other innovative communication strategies to showcase the bus initiative.

**Community engagement and employment** have already improved. The community bus concept brought a broad range of community members together to invest in the bus and
support the development of the new society to host the bus initiative. The Riondel Seniors Association made a generous donation to operating funds for the bus, and grants through RDCK have allowed us to hire part-time drivers and a dispatcher. The community bus group is coordinating with the Better at Home volunteer drivers program for seniors, and there is talk of including an Uber type arrangement to meet the transport needs of people who live up mountains. The bus is reigniting the spirit of the communities of Area A.

Community support and health and wellness concerns bring the small local communities in Area A together around this project. Lack of access to health services in Crawford Bay, Nelson, and Creston is considered urgent by our residents. Health connections buses to major hospitals in Cranbrook and Trail have not been accessible to seniors and other residents until now. Area A is half in the Kootenay West Regional Hospital District of Interior Health and the other half, south of Boswell, is in the Kootenay East Region which creates complications for our residents and means extra travel time. We are meeting with BC Transit this spring to discuss improved health connections.

Age-friendly Accomplishments to Date & Recognition.

The Riondel Commission of Management received Age-Friendly Recognition Award in 2013 (attached) This current proposal would review earlier assessments and apply for Age-Friendly Recognition for all of the small communities of Area A including Kootenay Bay, Crawford Bay, Gray Creek, Boswell, and Wynndel.

Riondel Age Friendly Community Committee and representatives from other community organizations hosted Healthy Aging/Aging Well Workshop (a partnership initiative between BC Healthy Communities and the Ministry of Health) in March 2018.

Riondel Age Friendly Community Committee, composed of older adults and seniors, in coordination with East Shore Trail and Bike Association received grants and completed Heritage Trails in Riondel.

East Shore Kootenay Lake Community Health Society (ESKLCHS) has completed several studies including:

◆ Health and Emergency Services Study, Selkirk College, 2014

◆ Better at Home study of needs of older residents Riondel to Boswell, 2015

◆ Research and public presentation on Inter-generational Programs, Selkirk College nursing students, 2017

East Shore Transportation Society completed survey of transportation needs of residents of Area A, 2019 (see attached)
Elder Care project with BC Healthy Communities Society will produce and publish an Intergenerational Guide, 2019/2020

Area A Official Community Plan was updated in 2013, but does not have the language of age friendly or disabilities inclusion and access to services. This project will work to add these elements to the OCP.

Creston and District Areas A, B, C updated the Recreation Masterplan in 2018/2019. Recommendation 3 states to “ensure programming is in place to address the needs of the sizable and growing population of older adults” and encourages partnerships between recreational facilities and health and community groups to ensure this programming.

Can the Ministry of Health contact you to discuss completing Age-friendly Community recognition?

X Yes No

Proposed Activities

1) Engage and consult seniors, seniors organizations, other community organizations and businesses in each of the communities in Area A to assess inclusion and access of older adults/elders to transportation, communication, and home support services. Work with the education committee of East Shore Kootenay Lake Community Health Society and nursing students of Selkirk College, if possible in terms of timing, to support this consultation.

2) Enhance and promote active transportation and recreation for older adults to improve social connections, and create better health outcomes and less dependence on the health care system. Meet with regional and provincial recreation and transportation staff and coordinate with local active groups including walking, two hiking groups, East Shore Trail and Bike Association, equestrian and other groups, and seniors organizations.

3) Coordinate with Better at Home, Riondel Seniors Association, East Shore Transportation Society and five active Hall boards to identify gaps in access to transportation amenities and services on the East Shore/Wynndel, identify supports and suggestions, and take appropriate action by specific groups.

4) Review safety issues in transportation in Area A and propose supports to provincial government and Regional District. (examples might include drinking/driving- no taxis, lack of bus stops, bus lanes, signage, bike and ski racks, etc.)
2) Specific Activities

**April 2020-** Form Age-friendly Area A Advisory Council. Contract consultant(s). Initial planning of activities and at least three meetings of the Council.

**May, June 2020-** Meet with seniors, seniors organizations and 5 community halls on location throughout Area A. Conversations include age-friendly elements and transportation- what are they already doing, what is going well? Collect baseline information. Report out to participants, Advisory Council, and prepare online and hard copy age-friendly survey.

**July, August 2020-** Pop up walk and bike events put on by the Age-friendly Advisory Council- raise awareness among seniors and some visitors on walking/hiking/biking trails, get suggestions for coordination, culture, convenience of trails and bus routes. Market and administer survey(s). Celebrate active recreation and transit- invite all active groups to participate- take information out to their membership.

**September to December 2020-** Work with Selkirk College students and Advisory Council to plan two community conversations in north and south valley to identify safety issues and transportation amenities and services. Research options to meet needs and improve safety and amenities.

**January to March 2021-** Consolidate and publish results of surveys and community conversations. Engage in possibility mapping with key informants. Use interactive maps to suggest and discuss bus stops, signage, and other amenities needed. Publish all results and final report back.

**Program Goals & Objectives.**

Community discussions and events at the very local level and at a regional level will raise awareness of our elderly residents, their unique and shared needs, and how our existing community services are supporting aging residents. We take an asset based approach to recognizing what is working, identifying issues and opportunities and bringing resources to the table where possible. We can expect that follow-up action plans will be assumed by a variety of organizations including community halls, health and seniors organizations and provincial and regional authorities, and that improvements for older residents will be made over time. By the end of the year long project, our seniors will feel that they have participated and been heard by decision makers and authorities.

Our application is based on local priorities and plans around public transportation as well as issues and opportunities around active transportation planning. It is community driven by non-profit organizations and local government. The project plan outlines steps in the planning process, but remains flexible to match the unique character of the Age friendly Advisory Council to be formed early in the process. Seniors engaged in the advisory council,
and other local leaders will want to develop the plan using their own creativity and insight—thus the plan is open-ended. The planning process will result in action plans within a variety of organizations and local and provincial responsibilities. Sustainability is an important value of our communities and is expressed in the current OCP. Relationships with the health authorities are on-going through our active ESKL Community Health Society; coordination with the health society and their participation on the advisory council will be critical. Relationships with the Lower Kootenay Band are expected to develop around transportation options, and invitations will be extended to participate in these age-friendly discussions to achieve equity and inclusion in all activities associated with this grant.

**Intended Outcomes, Deliverables & Impacts**

1) An **Age-friendly Area A Council** will be set up as an advisory committee for this project. See list of local and regional partners which include seniors, health, home support services, libraries, and other community organizations. The council will invite and meet with regional organizations such as RDCK, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure, Interior Health staff and Lower Kootenay Band as needed for specific issues/opportunities. This group will oversee community planning processes and identify agencies/resources for follow-up action plans. This group will **review Official Community Plan** and make recommendations for age-friendly and disabilities accessibility and inclusion to Regional District of Central Kootenay.

2) **Age-friendly scan** of access and inclusion of seniors/elders in transportation, communication and home support services in each of the 5 communities and rural areas of Area A. Meet with hall boards, complete **online and hardcopy survey, develop a baseline report for discussion**. Through two or three **public engagement meetings**, get input from residents and report back to each community, Regional District staff, Economic Action Partnership (Creston and District economic development office), Economic Development Commission and Recreation Commissions of Area A.

3. **Active Transportation Planning** local meetings with walking, biking, hiking, equestrian groups as well as East Shore Transportation Society, East Shore Trail and Bike Society and regional district staff to map out what we have for trails, discuss coordination, culture and convenience issues and opportunities. **Make recommendations and potentially develop action plans** with RDCK recreation and transportation planners, provincial Sites and Trails, and local trail groups and tourism/business development groups such as the Chamber of Commerce and Building East Shore Tourism group.

4. Consider and **identify safety issues with active and public transportation for each community and the regional Area A** - examples might be bus shelters, bike lanes, bike racks, or other issues. Research and plan for resources to relieve safety issues- work with BC Transit, RDCK, or health authorities to **create and carry out action plans**.
Community Partners & Participation by Seniors and Elders

Local Partners from Area A: will send representatives to sit on the Age Friendly Advisory Council of Area A. The Council will meet at least three times during the year of the proposed proposal and will plan, promote, and evaluate community planning work.

South Kootenay Lake Community Service Society (Community Connections)
East Shore Kootenay Lake Community Health Society (SKLCHS)
Better at Home Advisory Committee
Riondel Age Friendly Community Committee
Riondel Seniors Association
Fifty-five Plus Club (Crawford Bay)
East Shore Transportation Society
East Shore Bike and Trail Association
East Shore Community Library (Crawford Bay)
Riondel Community Library
Yasodhara Ashram Society

East Shore Hall Boards (to be confirmed once funded)- Commission of Management (Riondel), Crawford Bay Hall and Parks Board, Gray Creek Hall, Boswell Memorial Hall, and Wynndel Community Hall

Garry Jackman, Regional Director, Area A RDCK

Agency participants in the Age-Friendly Area A Council:

Principal, Crawford Bay Elementary and Secondary School CBESS, School District 8

Tom Dool, Transportation Planning, Regional District of Central Kootenay, Nelson, BC.

Terri Doman of Kootenay East Hospital District and Cheryl Whittleton of Kootenay West Hospital District. Both are Interior Health.

Lower Kootenay Band, Creston

Direct Participation of Seniors/Elders in the Age-Friendly Area A Council will be predominantly senior and elder residents. This is because most of our community
organizations are composed mainly of senior and elder volunteers. The council will collaborate with other community organizations including the East Shore Youth Council and Parent Advisory Council to engage in inter-generational programs and events.

**Evaluation.**

The Age Friendly Advisory Council will identify performance indicators and measures at initial planning meeting (in consultation with contractor and BC Healthy Communities).

**Overall evaluation:**

How many seniors participated in teas and local meetings? What percentage of total participants in each community event are seniors? What are main barriers to participation and how were these overcome?

Monitoring: We expect participation by our regional director in the local and regional meetings. Contractors will report to the regional director and provide services to the Age Friendly Area A Council.

The baseline report to be completed by November, 2020 will contain survey results, and results of the local meetings. These results will be discussed by the advisory council, seniors and health organizations and will form the basis of at least four action plans with diverse agencies and organizations. The final report will include results and how far along are the action plans in March, 2021.

Recommendations and policy suggestions will be presented by the Advisory Council or contractor to the designated agency. Recommendations to the OCP will be advanced to our regional director Garry Jackman.

Information gathered will be shared, while personal confidence is protected, to local media and websites such as East Shore.life and Kootenay Lake Chamber of Commerce.

**Support from BC Healthy Communities (BCHC) Society.**

Would you be interested in additional information to learn more about possible supports from BCHC Society?

X Yes No

If yes, please indicate which supports BCHC offers would be most beneficial for your proposed plan.

Engagement strategies, evaluation and monitoring processes, facilitated community planning processes, needs assessments.
**Additional Information.** Please share any other information you think may help support your submission.

The population in Area A, as compared to other areas in the RDCK is older and we have fewer younger families. This can be seen by the population graph attached to this application. This creates considerable challenges to be able to offer our elderly residents a good quality of life. We are however, committed to keeping people in their homes as long as possible and are slowly setting up Better at Home and other services. Your help to bring the age-friendly focus to all of our residents and smaller communities will help to identify many elements that can be strengthened, once the awareness that arises out of community conversations is available. The community bus is seen as a unifying resource, and we appreciate your support in helping to pull our small communities together.

**SECTION 3: Required Attachments**

1) Budget

2) Council/Board or Band Council Resolution

3) Results of Area A Transportation Survey (June, 2019)

4) Population Stats for Area A in RDCK

5) Support letters: Garry Jackman, Director, Area A, RDCK.
   Tom Wishart, Chair, East Shore Kootenay Lake Community Health Society
   Wendy Millar, Chair of Riondel Age Friendly Community Committee
   Peggy Skelton, Chair of Better at Home Advisory
   Catherine White, Chair of East Shore Transportation Society

**SECTION 4:**

Signature:

Name: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________

Date: ___________________________
**Moving Forward in Area A**

**AGE FRIENDLY STREAM ONE PROJECT BUDGET**

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Details</th>
<th>Total Amount Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support, record keeping, financial records, interim and final report back. Includes ink, copies, office supplies, and publishing.</td>
<td>$3750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Administration Budget $3750

### Contractor Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Details</th>
<th>Total Amount Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local contractor(s) to coordinate events, public meetings and research; liaise with Advisory Council and local organizations; write and support action plans, proposals and grants 40 hours/month $25 X 12 months</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor(s)- IT support, survey, social media/communications 100 hours @ $50/hour</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Contract Fees Budget $17,000

### Meeting Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Details</th>
<th>Total Amount Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 small community meetings and 3-4 larger public meetings, 3 Age Friendly Advisory meetings, pop up tents/events Refreshments, materials and supplies, rentals</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Meeting Costs Budget $2,500

### Other Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Details</th>
<th>Total Amount Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation support for students, seniors</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing costs- flyers, posters, materials, reports</td>
<td>$1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Other Cost Budget $1750

**TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET** $25,000
January 7, 2020

Stuart Horn  
CAO, Regional District of Central Kootenay  
Box 590  
202 Lakeside Drive  
Nelson, BC  V1L 5R4

Dear Mr. Horn,

1. The purpose of this letter is to seek support and a funding commitment for a potential fibre optic backbone project commencing in Fruitvale, through the program eligible communities of Park Siding, Meadows, Erie, Ymir, and Hall and terminating in Nelson. The route of the project would follow along parts of highways 3B (from Fruitvale), highway 3 and highway 6. The Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation is evaluating a potential application submission to the Connecting BC program prior to the current intake deadline of Feb 15, 2020; CBBC also is evaluating a submission to the CRTC Broadband Fund Program prior to the current intake deadline of March 27, 2020.

Background

2. Broadband connectivity in rural Canada continues to be a challenge and in response the Federal Government has created a funding program through the CRTC.

3. In addition, the Province of British Columbia is continuing its program called Connecting BC to assist in bringing connectivity to underserved areas.

4. Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation (CBBC) established by the Columbia Basin Trust in 2011 has a mandate to bring better connectivity into the region.

5. Over the past eight years the CBBC has constructed approximately 1000km of fibre optic backbone throughout many of the Basin highway corridors as well as established numerous Point of Presence (POP) breakout locations in communities along the backbone route.

6. Fibre backbone is the primary infrastructure required to enable last mile services to residents and businesses. The Regional District of Central Kootenay has supported the efforts of the CBBC on other backbone projects and the results of that support have led to several Internet Service Providers extending their networks to reach more communities.

Project Overview

7. The project proposal is to construct approximately 70 km of fibre optic backbone.

8. Five (5) new POP locations would be constructed in the program eligible communities of Park Siding, Meadows, Erie, Ymir, and Hall.
9. It is estimated that there are approximately 1000 households (over 1500 households if Village of Salmo is included) located in this corridor.

10. This project is the precursor and an infrastructure dependency for future last mile services to residents.

11. The estimated cost of this backbone project is $3,700,000.

12. In addition to RDCK’s funding commitment, match funding will be sought from the CRTC Broadband fund, the Connecting BC program and the Columbia Basin Trust.

13. Below is a map of the project area. The red line is the proposed backbone build and the green arrows indicate the eligible communities (Park Siding, Meadows, Erie, Ymir, and Hall) according to the CRTC.

14. Note: the communities listed above are those advertised by the CRTC as being ‘eligible’ for backbone services for both the CRTC and Connecting BC programs. Several communities are omitted from the eligibility list for reasons unknown at this time. CBBC plans to inquire further with both programs to better understand the criteria for community eligibility.
Resolution

THAT a letter of support be provided to Columbia Basin Broadband Corporation for their application to the Connecting BC program and the CRTC Broadband Fund, indicating an intent for RDCK to provide a contribution of up to $400,000 (11%) towards the proposed broadband infrastructure project.

Sincerely,

Dave Lampron
Chief Operating Officer

Attached. (CBBC’s Current Network Map)
Agreement Identification Number # 232LA0385

LETTER OF AGREEMENT

BETWEEN:

Her Majesty the Queen in the Right of the Province of British Columbia, as represented by the MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

West Kootenay District
4th Floor – 310 Ward Street, Nelson BC, V1L 5S4
(the "Ministry")

AND:

Regional District of Central Kootenay
Box 590, 202 Lakeside Drive, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
(the "RDCK")

(collectively the "Parties")

Re: West Kootenay District Transit Minor Betterments 2019/2020

WHEREAS:

A. The Ministry has agreed in the multi-year public transit plan for the West Kootenay District to carry out the transit minor betterments program (the "Program"). The Program is carried out in partnership between the RDCK and the Ministry where both parties approve bus stop signage and shelter locations, the RDCK procures the supply and installation of the signs, lighting and shelters and the Ministry allows for the works.

The Ministry and the RDCK wish to enter into this Letter of Agreement (the "Agreement") for the purposes of ensuring the supply and installation of bus shelters and bus stop signage at the locations agreed to under the Program.

The purpose of this Agreement is to outline the scope of work and the terms of that work, all as further described below.

For good and valuable consideration (the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged by each party to the other), the Parties agree to the terms set out in this Agreement:
DEFINITIONS

1. The following defined terms are used in this Agreement

   a. “Prime Contractor” means a “prime contractor” as defined and described in the Workers Compensation Act (BC) and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulations BC Reg 296/97, as amended. 

   b. “Subcontractor” means any contractor hired to perform any portion of the Work to which the Ministry is not a party.

DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK

2. The RDCK’s work and services will consist of supplying the bus shelters, bus stop signage and lighting in coordination with the Ministry for their installation. See attached Schedule A - Works and Services for locations.

   (the “Work”).

MINISTRY’S OBLIGATIONS

3. The Ministry will pay a maximum amount of $179,000 inclusive of applicable taxes, if any, (exclusive of GST) to the RDCK for the Work.

4. As part of the overall Program and the Work identified in this Agreement, the Ministry will ensure the installation of the bus shelter and bus stop signage and in addition will ensure the completion of any required road works and improvements necessary to facilitate such installations as contemplated under the Program and agreed to with the RDCK. See attached Schedule A – Work and Services.

5. The name and address of the Ministry contact for this Agreement is:

   Attn: Ryan Oakley
   Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
   4th Floor, 310 Ward Street
   Nelson, BC V1L 5S4

November 21, 2019
232LA0385
RDCK'S OBLIGATIONS

6. The RDCK will comply with and ensure compliance with any and all applicable laws and regulations in relation to this Agreement and the Work.

7. For greater certainty, the RDCK and any of its Subcontractors must be registered with WorkSafeBC and WorkSafe BC coverage must be maintained for the duration of the term of this Agreement.

8. The RDCK will provide evidence of insurance to the Ministry by completing and providing a Certificate of Insurance (Ministry form H0111) in accordance with Schedule C – Insurance Specifications (INS-80).

9. The RDCK will provide proof of any Subcontractor insurance and the RDCK will ensure that evidence of insurance is available to the Ministry by providing a Certificate of Insurance (Ministry form H0111) in accordance with Schedule C – Insurance Specifications (INS-80) insurance.

10. The RDCK will be responsible for all aspects of the Work, or associated with this Agreement as set out in Schedule A – Works and Services.

11. The RDCK will at all times indemnify and save harmless Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia, as represented by the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, and the employees, servants, and agents of the Minister from and against all claims, actions, causes of action, demands, losses, damages, costs, liabilities, expenses, fines, fees, penalties, assessments and levies, made against or incurred, suffered or sustained by any of them, at any time or times (whether such interest, fines or costs are court ordered or otherwise and whether before or after the expiration or termination of this Agreement) where the same or any of them are sustained in any way as a result of this Agreement, which indemnity will survive the expiration or sooner termination of this Agreement.

12. The name and address of the RDCK contact for this Agreement is:

   Attn: Tom Dool
   Regional District of Central Kootenay
   Box 590, 202 Lakeside Drive
   Nelson, BC V1L 5R4

SUBCONTRACTING

13. The RDCK may utilize qualified Subcontractors in the execution of the Work. Use of Subcontractors by the RDCK does not modify the RDCK obligations under this Agreement.
COMPLIANCE WITH WORK SCHEDULE

14. If the Work is falling behind schedule to such an extent that the date of completion or any identified milestones may not be met, the RDCK will immediately submit details of the action that the RDCK proposes to take to bring the Work back on schedule.

PRIME CONTRACTOR

15. The RDCK is the Prime Contractor under the Agreement and in respect of the site and specified areas. The RDCK acknowledges and agrees that other employers including the provincial highway maintenance contractor, utility companies, municipalities, and consultants to the RDCK may be performing work within or adjacent to the site or specified area, and without limiting the terms of the Agreement and the Workers' Compensation Act and OHS Regulation, the RDCK will coordinate the health and safety related activities of all employers in connection with the site and the specified area.

FEES AND PAYMENT

16. The Ministry will pay for the Work in accordance with the payment provisions set out below:

   a. Upon satisfactory completion and acceptance of the Work by the Ministry, payment will be made in accordance with the attached Schedule B – Payment Schedule. The RDCK will submit an invoice(s) for payment of services rendered to the following address:

      Attn: Ryan Oakley
      Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
      4th Floor, 310 Ward Street
      Nelson, BC V1L 5S4

   b. The invoice(s) should reference Agreement number 232LA0385

17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, the payment of money by the Ministry to the RDCK is subject to:

   a. there being sufficient monies available in an appropriation, as defined in the Financial Administration Act (the "FAA"), to enable the Ministry in the fiscal year when payment falls due to make that payment; and

   b. Treasury Board, as defined in the FAA, not having controlled or limited, pursuant to the FAA, expenditure under any appropriation referred to in subparagraph (a) of this paragraph.
18. The RDCK will establish and maintain accurate books of accounts and records, including supporting documents, of all costs incurred and monies paid in connection with the Work and of the application of funds contributed by the Ministry, and will permit the Ministry at any time or times during normal business hours to copy or audit, or both, any or all of such books or account and records, including supporting documents.

TERM

19. The Parties agree that the term of this Agreement will commence on the date of execution by the Ministry and will end on March 31, 2020 unless sooner terminated by the Ministry.

TERMINATION

20. The Ministry may terminate this Agreement:
   a. immediately for the RDCK's failure to comply with this Agreement by giving written notice of termination to the RDCK, and
   b. for any other reason by giving at least ten (10) days written notice of termination to the RDCK.

21. If the Ministry terminates this Agreement under paragraph (b) above, the Ministry will pay the RDCK the portion of fees and expenses described in the Fees and Payment Section, which equals the portion of the Work that was completed to the Ministry's satisfaction before termination. The final payment is calculated solely by the Ministry, acting reasonably and at its discretion it may include the right to setoff amounts from final payment and may pursue other remedies. The payment discharges the Ministry from all liability under this Agreement.

GENERAL

22. The Parties agree that any amendment to the terms and conditions of this Agreement must be in writing and duly executed by both Parties.

23. The RDCK must not assign its right and obligations under this Agreement without the Ministry's prior written consent which can be withheld at the Ministry's discretion.

24. If there is a dispute in respect of this Agreement between the Ministry and RDCK the Parties agree to settle the dispute by way of negotiation.

25. The RDCK will at all times treat as confidential all documents and other information supplied to or obtained as a result of this Agreement and shall not permit the
publication, release or disclosure of the same without the prior written consent of the Ministry. This obligation survives the completion or termination of this Agreement.

26. The attached Schedules form part of this Agreement.

27. The Parties agree that this Agreement will be construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of British Columbia.

28. Time is of the essence in this Agreement.

**The Parties have executed this Letter of Agreement as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNED on behalf of Regional District of Central Kootenay on the ___ day of _________<em><strong>, 20</strong></em>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNED on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen in the right of the Province of British Columbia, as represented by the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure on the ___ day of _________<em><strong>, 20</strong></em>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agreement Identification Number # 232LA0385

SCHEDULE A
Work and Services Schedule

The RDCK will be responsible for performing all Work under this Agreement as follows:

a. Acquiring, supplying, and installing bus shelters;

b. Acquiring, supplying, and installing bus stop lighting; and

c. Coordinating the installation of bus stop signage and bus stop improvements with the Ministry.

The RDCK’s work and services will be in accordance with the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Hwy#</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>City/RD</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slocan Valley Shelters</td>
<td>RDCK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Procure and coordinate install of new shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slocan Valley Activated Bus Stop Light</td>
<td>RDCK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Procure and coordinate install of solar bus stop lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Bus Pullout Improvements</td>
<td>RDCK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coordinate improvements to bus pullouts on Hwy 3A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule:

The RDCK will complete the Work no later than March 31, 2020.
Agreement Identification Number # 232LA0385

SCHEDULE B
Payment Schedule

Upon satisfactory completion and acceptance by the Ministry of the following deliverables, the RDCK will submit invoice(s) for payment of services rendered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Hwy#</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount payable to RDCK for Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slocan Valley Shelters</td>
<td>Procure and coordinate install of new shelters</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slocan Valley Activated Bus Stop Light</td>
<td>Procure and coordinate install of solar bus stop lights</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Bus Pullout Improvements</td>
<td>Coordinate improvements to bus pullouts on Hwy 3A</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$179,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RDCK will obtain prior approval from the Ministry for any additional Work required. The Ministry will not make any payment for this additional Work without written pre-approval and an executed amendment to this Agreement.

The maximum amount payable under the Agreement for the Work is $179,000 inclusive of applicable taxes, if any (exclusive of GST).
Tom Dool
Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive
Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
250.352.8173

2020.01.08

CONTRACT - BUS SHELTERS (5)

Tom,

We are pleased to provide the following contract to supply five bus shelters for the Regional District of Central Kootenay.

A. GENERAL NOTES

1. This contract is based on the Spearhead Issue for Construction Shop Drawings dated 2018.10.25
2. Price includes the provision of complete, precise and detailed shop drawings relative to the scope of components being supplied. This includes all final fabrication and site interface drawings, indicating all timber members, connections and installation information as required.

B. SCOPE OF WORK

1. HEAVY TIMBER & STEEL

   1. Timber supplied as radio frequency kiln dried, free of heart, select structural, douglas fir. Timber provided with a wire brushed texture. Material volume is 150 board feet per unit.
   2. Siding supplied as rough sawn, western red cedar, #1 and better, 70 board feet per unit.
   3. Timber and siding to be prefabricated with two coats of Cloverdale, Sunfast exterior wood finish.
   4. Glass supplied as 10mm tempered clear glass with brushed nickel support brackets.
   5. Total volume of steel per unit approximately 840 lbs. Steel supplied with a powder coated finish.
   6. All hardware as required for the shelter is included with the exception of the column connections to the concrete.

2. NOTABLE EXCLUSIONS

   1. Installation.
   2. Concrete pad (if required).
   3. Re-engineering (if required)
   4. Glazing for back of shelter, if required.
   5. Concrete embeds.
   6. Future maintenance.
   7. Shipping, price is FOB Spearhead.
   8. Applicable taxes.

C. CONTRACT AMOUNT: $73,400.00
D. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THIS AGREEMENT

1. The parties hereto agree that the following terms and conditions shall be applicable to this agreement:

E. CLIENT RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Examine documents submitted by Spearhead and provide decisions and approvals as necessary within ten working days so as not to unreasonably delay the work of Spearhead.
2. Immediately notify Spearhead in writing if the client observes or otherwise becomes aware of any fault or defect in the design of the structural package.

F. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF THE CLIENT

1. The client acknowledges and accepts that Spearhead is being asked to design principally with wood and, accordingly, Spearhead shall not be responsible for any wood shrinkage, checking or movement caused by natural drying of wood after installation; however, Spearhead shall take such drying into effect as best as reasonably possible in preparing its work product provided for herein.
2. All drawings supplied by Spearhead will be sent by electronic format only. Any printing related costs are the responsibility of the client.

G. CHANGES TO WORK

1. Changes to work shall not take place until client has confirmed conditions in a signed change order prepared by Spearhead.
2. Change orders will refer to specific change order directives, addenda, site instructions etc.

H. FEES AND DISBURSEMENTS

1. Invoiced amounts shall be paid to Spearhead within 30 days of clients receipt of invoice and, failing receipt of payment, Spearhead may suspend or terminate its work under this agreement, subject to its rights expressed elsewhere herein to bill for further works completed and not yet billed. See below for phasing of contract payments in relation to project development.

I. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit to Start &amp; Material Procurement January 2020</td>
<td>$33,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Progress Draw - March 2020</td>
<td>$33,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment Upon Completion - April 2020 (10% of remaining balance)</td>
<td>$7,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$73,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. TERMINATION

1. This agreement may be terminated by either party upon not less than seven days' written notice to the other should either party fail to substantially perform in accordance with the terms of this agreement through no fault of the party initiating the other than termination pursuant to above. Spearhead shall submit an invoice to the client for all works completed at the date of termination (together with disbursements incurred to date and applicable taxes) and client shall make payment of such invoice within 30 days. Said invoicing will include partial completion of any phase of work along with anticipated profit and overheads on work completed including but not limited to items such as third party material orders or supplier restocking fees, contracted at the termination point on behalf of the project. In the event that Spearhead is still holding the initial deposit or portion thereof, Spearhead shall be entitled to make partial or whole payment of this account from such deposit funds and such deposit, or portion thereof, shall be deemed irrevocably earned by Spearhead at such time.
2. Spearhead is not responsible for the deterioration of glulams in the case of delay by the client to the raising date of this contract by more than 60 days. Any costs to repair the glulam frame are the responsibility of the client. Spearhead and the client will mutually agree upon the installation date in writing.

K. GOVERNING LAW

1. This agreement shall be governed by the law of the Province of British Columbia and the laws of Canada applicable therein. Each of the parties hereto irrevocably attorns to the jurisdiction of the Courts of the Province of British Columbia with respect to any and all matters arising from this agreement. In the case of dispute arising from the contract terms both parties shall strive to first reconcile through mutual mediation prior to pursuing legal action. If the foregoing terms and conditions are acceptable to you, please sign and date both copies of this agreement and return one to me. The effective date of this agreement will be the date of your acceptance.

Respectfully Submitted By Spearhead

[Signature]

Tara Primeau

The undersigned client as referred to above hereby accepts the terms and conditions of this contract and encloses the initial payment described herein.

Authorized Signatory - RDCK

[Signature]

Name, Date
INTRODUCTION:
Community groups, external stakeholders and local municipalities often request letters from the RDCK indicating support for a local project or initiative or for a grant application. The purpose of this policy is to establish a framework for how these requests are considered for approval by the RDCK Board, Commissions, Directors and staff. This policy also defines circumstances where RDCK Commissions and individual Directors may provide letters of support without Board approval.

SCOPE:
The policy applies to all requests for letters of support requested of the RDCK. The policy does not apply to funding support requested through the Community Development Grant or Discretionary Grant programs.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS
All incoming requests for letters of support should be discussed with the applicable senior manager to route the request through the appropriate approval process and to ensure consistency with this policy. Requests for letters of support from the RDCK are generally referred to the Board for consideration. The Board, as the governing body of the RDCK, has the sole discretion to determine whether or not to support a request. Unless otherwise provided for within this policy, letters of support may only be authorized by a Board resolution.

Requests for RDCK Board support for projects or initiatives that are related to a service directly operated by the RDCK, and where there is an applicable Committee or Commission in place, should be considered first by that Committee or Commission. If the request is supported, it would then be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation to support the request. If the timing of a request is such that the initial consideration by the Committee or Commission is not practical, the Board may consider the request directly.
LETTER OF SUPPORT APPROVAL
RDCK Commissions and Directors are sometimes requested to provide letters of support for projects and initiatives in their communities. This may be expedient and effective for the RDCK, with limitations.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM INDIVIDUAL RDCK DIRECTORS.

Directors may send letters of support for a specific project or initiative without Board approval only where all of the following circumstances apply:

- The project or initiative for which support is requested is directly applicable within that Director’s electoral area;
- The project or initiative is consistent with bylaws, policies and/or plans previously approved by the RDCK Board;
- The project or initiative is not generally known or expected to be contentious or likely to be perceived to have a negative impact on other communities within the RDCK.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM RDCK COMMISSIONS.

RDCK Commissions may send letters of support for a specific project or initiative without Board approval only where all of the following circumstances apply:

- The project or initiative for which support is requested is directly applicable within the electoral areas and municipalities in which the Board has delegated governance responsibilities to the Commission;
- The project or initiative for which support is requested is directly related to the approved mandate and regular operations of the Commission;
- The project or initiative is consistent with bylaws, policies and/or plans previously approved by the RDCK Board;
- The Commission has authorized the letter of support by resolution.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM COMMISSIONS AND DIRECTORS

In all circumstances where a Commission or an individual Director issues a letter of support the letter must conform to all of the following requirements:

- The letter must be sent on Director or Commission letterhead, not RDCK letterhead;
- The letter must include a clear statement that the request has not been considered by the RDCK Board, and that support is from the Commission or Director only;
- The content letter of the letter cannot imply the support of the RDCK Board, limit the ability of the Board to exercise its lawful authority, or promise future action on the part of the RDCK;
- All letters of support issued by Commissions or individual Directors shall be placed on the next Board agenda as information items.
REQUIREMENTS FOR RDCK BOARD APPROVAL FOR A LETTER OF SUPPORT

For certainty, the Board must approve any request for a letter of support to which any of the following circumstances apply:

- When the requested RDCK support involves a financial commitment from the RDCK that is not included within the current year financial plan;
- When the requested RDCK support requires an in-kind contribution of staff time to the project;
- When the requested RDCK support is not directly related to an RDCK service or within the typical mandate of the RDCK;
- When a reasonable person would conclude that the project or initiative for which support is requested is contentious or may be perceived to have negative impacts on the public interest in other RDCK communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Responsible Manager</th>
<th>Board Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Project Drivers</th>
<th>Applicable Areas of RDCK</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Board Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slocan Valley Watershed &amp; Ecosystem Guidance Document</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area 9, Village of Slocan, Village of Silverton, Village of New Denver</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2021-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Deadstock Biofuel Scoping Study</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Boundary Farm Advisory</td>
<td>2017-03-31</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Food security and Agriculture</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK, Multi Regional</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending; Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-06-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDMP Stream 2 Flood and geohazard mapping</td>
<td>2018-08-15</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Consultant procurement, Research and data gathering phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Energy Specialist Year 2</td>
<td>2017-03-31</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending; Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Development Institute Climate Change Indicators</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Delayed pending action by key stakeholder; Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2021-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Management Governance Initiative</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending; Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEP Regional Energy Efficiency Program</td>
<td>2018-10-18</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution; Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-02-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay Food Policy Council</td>
<td>2017-05-01</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Food security and Agriculture</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2018-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations Engagement Policy</td>
<td>2017-01-01</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff/Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2018-10-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Based Planning Project - Central Kootenay Food Policy Council</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Food security and Agriculture</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff/Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2021-01-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Lakes Partnership</td>
<td>2011-03-03</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff/Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area H, Village of Kaslo, City of Nelson</td>
<td>50%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-04-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground Bylaw Review</td>
<td>2018-04-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-09-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Servicing Bylaw Review</td>
<td>2018-01-10</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2019-05-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Project</td>
<td>2017-12-14</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Funding decision is pending</td>
<td>2019-12-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Initiative</td>
<td>2018-10-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Public consultation period</td>
<td>2019-02-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Bylaw Review - Phase 2</td>
<td>2019-03-25</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Food security and Agriculture</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area F, Area I, Area J, Area K</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Registry</td>
<td>2018-10-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area A, Area D, Area E, Area G, Area H</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Funding decision is pending</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I Community Plan Review</td>
<td>2016-01-26</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Public consultation period, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2019-12-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Removal and Deposit Bylaw</td>
<td>2015-11-04</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>60-80% complete</td>
<td>Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2019-12-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Building Inspection Service Agreement with Municipalities</td>
<td>2018-10-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Building</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Salmo, Village of Kaslo, Village of Slocan, Village of Nakusp, Village of Silverton, Village of New Denver</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Officials Training Program</td>
<td>2018-11-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Building</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Village of Salmo, Village of Kaslo, Village of Slocan, Village of Nakusp, Village of Silverton, Village of New Denver, All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>60-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase</td>
<td>2019-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converting Historical Building Permits to Digital format</td>
<td>2018-03-31</td>
<td>Mgr. Building</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area L, Area K</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project design phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Services Policy Review</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Building</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Requirements for Establishment of Water Supply Board</td>
<td>2019-12-12</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area J, Town of Creston</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-04-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Creek Dike Repair</td>
<td>2017-11-15</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2011-08-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Denver Siding Water System to New Denver</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area H, Village of New Denver</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting public hearing, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-10-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management Planning for Utilities</td>
<td>2017-06-15</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>80% - 99% complete</td>
<td>Public consultation period</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services Fee Report</td>
<td>2015-05-21</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Board or Committee requested as action item, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering, Options evaluation for internal approval, Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Creek/Erickson Reservoir site - drainage issues</td>
<td>2017-06-01</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-07-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister and area water system expansion</td>
<td>2017-06-19</td>
<td>GM Environmental Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>60% - 80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and Initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of ICI recycling services</td>
<td>2019-12-12</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and Initial investigations, Contractor procurement</td>
<td>2020-05-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of RBC Satellite depot hauling</td>
<td>2019-12-12</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Contractor procurement</td>
<td>2020-03-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB Tailings Facility Remediation and Closure</td>
<td>2016-08-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Committee assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency, Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Landfill southbound ditch and Phase 1E waste relocation</td>
<td>2018-07-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement, Project construction phase</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Soil Policy Update</td>
<td>2018-06-22</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-12-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outisochenia Landfill Design and Operation plan update</td>
<td>2017-04-13</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion, West RR Subregion</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR program consultation</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK, Multi Regional</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Landfill Phase 1C/D, Berrm</td>
<td>2017-10-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder, Project design phase</td>
<td>2021-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycle BC - recycling service changeover</td>
<td>2018-03-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement, in active negotiations with affected parties, Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics program development</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Funding decision is pending, Project design phase, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Recovery Plan update</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDP</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson HNW year-round depot</td>
<td>2018-06-21</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebery Bin Wall - Y&amp;G</td>
<td>2018-03-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>West RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement, Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-08-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood / Burton site improvements</td>
<td>2018-03-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>West RR Subregion</td>
<td>80% - 99% complete</td>
<td>Project construction phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Septage Facility</td>
<td>2018-06-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, in active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2020-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional RR Facility surveillance upgrades</td>
<td>2018-03-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement, Research and data gathering phase, Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo area used oil collection</td>
<td>2018-12-05</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area D, Village of Kaslo, Central RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-04-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Facility washroom installation project</td>
<td>2018-12-12</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution, Project initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project design phase, Project construction phase</td>
<td>2021-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Eco-Depot</td>
<td>2018-10-10</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Contractor procurement</td>
<td>2020-09-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley SRM</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ootischenia landfill lands acquisition</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion, North RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Landfill Closure</td>
<td>2017-02-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Waste Management and Alternatives</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2021-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nukuski Landfill fill plan to closure</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Work plan</td>
<td>West RR Subregion</td>
<td>50%-60% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
<td>Consultant submitted draft design and operations plan update for Nukuski Landfill to guide activities to closure. Staff review is completed, finalization of plan is underway with 2018 LiDAR data. Change in new timeline for 2023, so engineers will review projections based on expected volumes over longer term. Revised report expected in Q2 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ootischenia Landfill public area upgrades</td>
<td>2018-02-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Work plan</td>
<td>West RR Subregion</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-10-31</td>
<td>ON HOLD. Pending determination of RBC depot space requirements for site entrance area and site development plans as part of E&amp;O update. Project is intended for reconfiguration of public drop off areas at the Ootischenia Landfill to improve on traffic flow, safety, and space utilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septage Management Options for Central and West subregions</td>
<td>2019-06-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion, West RR Subregion</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase; In active negotiations with affected parties; Options evaluation for internal approval; Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2020-03-03</td>
<td>Consultants have prepared preliminary options assessment. Assessment findings will go to Jan or Feb JRRC meeting for selection of preferred strategy which will then be further detailed and combined with the RRP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Screening</td>
<td>2019-02-21</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase; Project design phase; Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-04-30</td>
<td>Staff training and resident educational continuing 2020. Near end of 2019 began handing out 6mil bags at landfills for suspect asbestos containing loads for residents to properly contain asbestos waste for disposal. Investigating lined bins at landfills to alleviate some of the issues with acceptance of suspect asbestos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Waste management area at Creston Landfill</td>
<td>2019-12-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td>Work plan</td>
<td>East RR Subregion</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations; Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
<td>Project on hold pending obtaining License of Occupation for the &quot;wedge&quot; parcel. Intent is to improve site safety and meet best practices for handling/disposal, while reducing future liabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandonment of Pipe in Place &amp; Discharge of Easements Policy</td>
<td>2019-12-13</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area X</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
<td>The Regional District has abandoned a few Regional District owned water lines including asbestos cement pipe on private property as part of recent water line replacement projects. Abandonment in place is common practice due to cost of removal. Some property owners have since requested discharge of easement agreements. Drafting a policy on abandonment of pipes will provide consistency on future projects and help limit liability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Drinking Water Conservation Plan Implementation</td>
<td>2019-05-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area X</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-07-31</td>
<td>2018 annual reporting on Water Consumption &amp; Loss completed. 2019 reporting to be drafted in first quarter 2020. 2019 reporting will be expanded to include climate data and water demand forecasts. Development of a Water Loss Control &amp; Leak Reduction Program, and overall water meter implementation strategy is still outstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Servicing of Area C Properties from Erickson</td>
<td>2018-01-29</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
<td>No progress this quarter. Project is with Town of Creston for next action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanca Water Longterm Boil Risk Management Plan</td>
<td>2018-10-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow/Erickson Agriculture Usage and Future Demand Review</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area B, Area C</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-02-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Water Quality Upgrades</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfour Metering - Data Collection and Rate Planning</td>
<td>2018-10-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Public consultation period</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson Water Accounts Audit</td>
<td>2016-06-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area B, Area C</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-02-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson Metering Implementation Plan</td>
<td>2018-01-29</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area B, Area C</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SCADA Implementation</td>
<td>2013-10-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area K</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project construction phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Asset Management</td>
<td>2018-01-31</td>
<td>Sr. Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIRD Condition Assessment and Lifecycle Report - Asset Management Process</td>
<td>2019-06-01</td>
<td>Sr. Project Mgr.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area I, Area J, City of Castlegar</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Consultant procurement, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Infrastructure Construction Crew Business Case</td>
<td>2019-11-21</td>
<td>Utilities Operations Manager</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-01-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Slocan Direct Filtration or Deferal, Consultant Planning Phase</td>
<td>2017-12-13</td>
<td>Utilities Operations Manager</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area H</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>In active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2020-08-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Goat Riverside Park</td>
<td>2019-05-16</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>5% to 10% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Library Contract</td>
<td>2018-11-06</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Town of Creston</td>
<td>5% to 10% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2020-09-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Purchase of additional property around Cottonwood Lake</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, Area G, Village of Salmo, City of Nelson</td>
<td>65%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Allocation Policy</td>
<td>2017-01-01</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>65%-80% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee on Board is pending, Public consultation period, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-05-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Eddy Regional Park Private Land Acquisition</td>
<td>2017-07-01</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area I, Area J, City of Castlegar</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removing Reverter Clause on Old School House Property</td>
<td>2018-09-01</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area H</td>
<td>65%-80% complete</td>
<td>Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Land Corporation (incl. Cottonwood Lake Regional Park) Private Land</td>
<td>2017-11-01</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Committee assigned by resolution, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, Area G, Village of Salmo, City of Nelson</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Fields</td>
<td>2017-06-15</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, Area H, Area I, Area J, City of Castlegar, City of Nelson, Village of Sicton</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Commission #4 Review</td>
<td>2019-06-19</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s), Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area K, Village of Nakusp</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges Bylaw</td>
<td>2020-06-20</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>5% to 10% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-05-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges Policy</td>
<td>2019-06-20</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>1% to 10% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-11-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skatepark Host Program</td>
<td>2019-11-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending. Delayed pending action by key stakeholder, in active negotiations</td>
<td>2020-06-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench/Tree Donation Program</td>
<td>2019-11-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>60% - 80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Option: evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Curling Club - Facility Use Agreements</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Education Centre</td>
<td>2018-11-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Awaiting approval from external agency, Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Mower</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec.</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>80% - 99% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase, Option: evaluation for internal approval, Project construction phase</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Building
2019-01-01 Mgr. Creston Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston 20% to 40% complete Project scoping and initial investigations, Contractor procurement, Research and data gathering phase, Project design phase, Project construction phase 2020-03-31 Contract awarded. Service Building to support CECO operations and maintenance of outdoor assets including the new Skate park and Creston Community Park development.

Creston & District Community Complex - Creston Room Ramp/Dressing Room Project
2018-03-15 Mgr. Creston Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston 20% to 40% complete Research and data gathering phase, Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending, Funding decision is pending 2020-07-31 Pending funding decision. Project design, specifications and costing 100% complete. October 1, 2018 Hazardous material survey scheduled for November 2018. Investigate funding sources - Community Works Grant or Internal Reserves January 2019. Identified funding sources - Board authorisation to apply for infrastructure grants.

Creston Room Flooring and equipment upgrades
2017-03-15 Mgr. Creston Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston 100% complete Project implementation or commissioning phase 2019-11-30 Submitted final report to CBT. Discussions with contractor/vendors - procurement Proceed with equipment purchases and installations Schedule installation completed in August Commissioning - August/September Grant Administration - October 2019.

Creston & Areas A, B & C Parks & Recreation Masterplan
2018-03-15 Mgr. Creston Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston 80%-99% complete Research and data gathering phase, Public consultation period, Options evaluation and report preparation, Stakeholder consultation phase 2020-02-29 Draft Master plan and research reference document prepared and presented to Stakeholders and staff for review / edits/amendments. Further staff review and community feedback being received. Planning for finalized draft and presentation to Stakeholders and staff to take place in early December Review of final edits and feedback.

Arena Ice shed door replacement
2019-02-05 Mgr. Castlegar Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area L, Area J, City of Castlegar 100% complete Project implementation or commissioning phase 2019-11-29 Completed. Fire Panel pending. Doors installed. Project near completion. Doors need to be tied into Fire Panel (magnetic release) budget item 2020.

Rotary Skate Park Kiosk
2018-09-01 Mgr. Castlegar Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan Area L, Area J, City of Castlegar 100% complete Project construction phase 2019-12-31 Project 100% complete. Project initiated by local Rotary Club and Skate Board Community. Fully funded and planned by local Rotary club with support from Community and business volunteers and district staff. Project with enhance skate park summer program partnership with Kootenay Family Place.

Child Minding Pilot Project
2019-07-09 Mgr. Castlegar Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Committee assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year Area L, Area J, City of Castlegar 80%-99% complete Options evaluation for internal approval, Options evaluation and report preparation, Project implementation or commissioning phase 2019-12-27 Pilot project will end December 31, 2019. Proposal to continue program in 2020 Financial Plan. Project initiated by staff to offer child minding service to help drive business by reducing barriers to participation.

Castlegar & District Community Complex Facility Enhancement Project
2018-03-15 Mgr. Castlegar Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Board assigned by resolution Area L, Area J, City of Castlegar 40% to 60% complete Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending, Funding decision is pending, Options evaluation and report preparation 2021-08-31 Infrastructure Grant completed and sent. Funding decision expected late fall.

RDCK Inclusion and Access Task Force
2019-09-18 Mgr. Nelson Rec Recreation, Parks and Trails Committee assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year Entire RDCK 1% to 20% complete Research and data gathering phase 2020-12-31 On hold. Approval for development of Inclusion and Access task force has been received. Staff currently developing Task Force member list with anticipated first meeting to occur late October 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Responsible Manager</th>
<th>Board Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Project Drivers</th>
<th>Applicable Areas of RDCK</th>
<th>Project Completion Status</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Board Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Arena Brine Expansion Tank Repairs</td>
<td>2018-11-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Leafs Contract Renewal</td>
<td>2019-05-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-01-21</td>
<td>Draft Agreement with Nelson Leafs for review. Updating Operating Agreement with Nelson Leafs Jr B Hockey team. Five year agreement in order to cover repayment schedule for NDCC Arena sound system improvements. New template being used to provide standardized language with Creston and Castlegar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCC Exterior Sign Policy Development</td>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
<td>On hold. Initial indication is the best approach could be to create a RDCK wide signage guideline instead of a Policy. A Policy may not be able to cover all potential sign projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson and District Recreation Facilities Task Force Review</td>
<td>2017-10-17</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
<td>On hold. Task Force work part of ongoing discussions at Nelson and District Recreation Commission meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCC Parking Lot Monitoring</td>
<td>2019-03-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, In active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
<td>Develop partnership with City of Nelson to provide parking lot enforcement as parking is a significant challenge for NDCC users. Working with the City of Nelson to have Bylaw Enforcement patrol under City Bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Civic Arena Operations Contract</td>
<td>2019-06-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>In active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2019-07-31</td>
<td>Renewing contract with service provider for the day-to-day operation of Civic Arena. Service agreement includes ice maintenance, minor demand maintenance and custodial services. Waiting on final sign off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Curling Club Operations Request</td>
<td>2018-10-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, City of Nelson</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Decision of RDCC Committee or Board is pending, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
<td>The Nelson Curling Club has requested the RDCK Lake over the operations of the Nelson Curling Club refrigeration system. The Curling Club is a City of Nelson owned building that is currently being operated by the Nelson Curling Club. The Curling Club has been closed as a result of an ammonia leak in the plant room. The City of Nelson has given approval to the Nelson Curling Club to move forward with repairs in preparation of the 2019/2020 season. The Nelson and District Recreation Commission is expected to make a recommendation at its July 23, 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glade Legacy Project</td>
<td>2017-07-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project design phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
<td>Project commencement in the Spring 2020. Currently surveying the property and met with contractor to look at site for feasibility. Project to carry over into 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks &amp; Trails Master Plan/Strategy</td>
<td>2017-05-17</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Consultant procurement, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-11-28</td>
<td>Working Group meeting on October 10, 2019. Board appointed Directors Popoff, Anderson and Jackman to the working group assisting staff with the review of the Parks &amp; Trails Masterplan RFP at the June 20, 2019 meeting. Staff working on Regional Parks &amp; Trails Inventory is complete to a standard that allows us to proceed to RFP development. Anticipate a RFP award in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Bay Regional Park Management Plan</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-11-29</td>
<td>In financial plan for 2020, Biophysical completed. Open House conducted October 28, 2019. Biophysical RFP Addendum 1 posted early October. In consultation with First Nations and further funding required for Management Plan. Initial needs assessment is to further develop First Nations consultation and Governance (Commission or Select Project Committee?) This direction will guide Management Plan preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taghum/Blewett Boat Launch Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2015-06-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Award assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area E, Area F</td>
<td>40% to 65% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2010-11-27</td>
<td>TECK provided information that 3 sites chosen by the public were not suitable for a boat launch. Bill consulting with TECK and other consultants regarding feasibility of potential launch areas. Hall meeting with Area Directors and TECK and consultants. Moving to Phase 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks Design Standards</td>
<td>2017-09-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
<td>On hold. Waiting for Parks and Trails Strategic Plan completion. Asking for budget funds for 2020 for contract. Waiting on completion of Parks &amp; Trails Strategy. Working in conjunction with Parks &amp; Trails Inventory, staff adopting park facility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Creek Regional Park Governance Review</td>
<td>2017-06-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area L, Area J, City of Castlegar</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
<td>Working on RFP Spring 2020. Recommendations from the Management Plan. Looking into Governance of Pass Creek Campground and Pass Creek Exhibition Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Creek Regional Park - Management Plan Implementation</td>
<td>2017-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area I, Area J, City of Castlegar</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
<td>Implementation ongoing. Feasibility and Cost Study for swimming pond upgrades and spawning channel feasibility are complete. Report sent to Castlegar &amp; District Recreation Commission. Staff report forthcoming. Bridge connecting campgrounds and exhibition grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Creek Regional Park - Baseball Diamond Parking Area Design</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area I, Area J, City of Castlegar</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Consultant procurement</td>
<td>2019-12-27</td>
<td>Current phase on hold. Safety concerns with current access to Pass Creek Ball Diamond. Approved in the 2019 FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Bay Regional Park Development</td>
<td>2018-10-02</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
<td>Biophysical Assessment completed. Open House completed October 28, 2019. MIA Risk Assessment conducted and report forthcoming. Repairs done to bridge crossing and some signage to be installed at beach area. Currently working on Park liabilities in a maintenance capacity. Next steps will be to obtain MIA Risk Assessment and further investigation into Park Management work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier Creek Regional Park - Emergency Access Road</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area D, Village of Kaslo</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency</td>
<td>2030-12-31</td>
<td>Fuel prescription completed. Fuel treatment on hold awaiting UBCM funding. Met with Glacier Creek Commission and Wildlife Coordinator and hope to move forward with options provided at Commission meeting. FUEL flame treatment completed and currently in discussions with contractor regarding construction of road and campsites as part of FUEL treatment. Meeting with consultant and commission in spring 2019 after snow is gone to allow for construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Bay Regional Park - Field Replacement/Improvements</td>
<td>2017-03-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, Area G, Village of Salmo, Village of Nelson</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project construction phase</td>
<td>2020-07-31</td>
<td>Final field construction amendments should be finished by July 2020. Working with new Parks Operations Lead and Selkirk Irrigation. Final phase of project. Work on irrigation system to be completed by October 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lérieur Regional Park Management Plan</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recre., Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area D, Village of Kaslo</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting public hearing, Public consultation period</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
<td>Draft report completed and being reviewed. Open Houses held in Lérieur Valley and Kaslo in May. Information gathered with consultant. Awaiting report from consultant. Survey is completed. Public presentations of results being planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
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<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulpit Rock &amp; Lions Bluff Lake Access Management Plan (incl. 5 &amp; 6 Mile)</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area E, Area F, Area G, Village of Salmon, City of Nelson</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
<td>Pulpit Rock Society has now provided a Management Plan. Internal delays. Working with Pulpit Rock Society, Pulpit Rock Society has completed a management plan and acquired a LoO with MoTI. Area F Director has submitted 5 and 6 mile Beach as a priority. Staff is working towards RFP for Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Lake to Roseberry Rail Trail - Expansion</td>
<td>2019-03-21</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area H, Area K, Village of Sicamous, Village of Nakusp, Village of Silverton, Village of New Denver</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Awaiting approval from external agency, Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
<td>Provincial public announcement on trail status January 2020. Provincial Referral is in final stages. Waiting for outcome. Waiting on final Provincial approvals before Commission and Service Area approvals. Seeking partnership opportunities to facilitate ownership and management of trail to one body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A 5 Lake Access Areas</td>
<td>2017-12-30</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2021-12-31</td>
<td>Work to commence after completion of the Crawford Bay Regional Park Management Plan and upgrades. Further consultation with community and First Nations needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Bay Fire Service feasibility study</td>
<td>2016-01-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2021-04-01</td>
<td>The Research Analyst has completed an options review and currently with senior managers for concurrence, then to the Area Director for review. A report will be made available for October or November 2019 Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter training center feasibility study</td>
<td>2019-01-17</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Wildfire Management Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-03-01</td>
<td>This study has not commenced. Once vacant staff positions are filled this study could commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership with Thompson Rivers University (TRU) for RDCK certified firefighter training</td>
<td>2018-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Wildfire Management Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
<td>Thompson Firexers have indicated they will not be providing firefighter training. Staff are working with the Vancouver Island Response Academy as a viable alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire safety inspections database</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
<td>The Province of BC has yet to determine if a regular course of inspections will be required by Regional Districts. Preliminary work is now complete to identify the number of occupancies that would require inspection in the RDCK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid response flood trailer</td>
<td>2018-09-14</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-03-01</td>
<td>Training for S2 firefighters completed 23, 24 March, 2019 Flood response trailer (FRU) is ready for deployment. Still requires racking work which will be completed before freshet season 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston area Sub-Regional Fire Service</td>
<td>2012-01-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>In active negotiations with affected parties, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-04-01</td>
<td>Contract for Blythe Dam Fire Department to be managed by Creston Fire &amp; Rescue was approved at August Board. Staff are working with the Area Director to determine next steps for Canyon Lister Fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT testing program - firefighter SCBA safety</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Waiting approval from external agency</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
<td>Implementation will commence under contract in October for 2019 FIT testing, meeting worksafe requirements. Fire Services staff and the RDCK Safety Advisor will determine if owning the FIT testing equipment or continuing under contract is most viable for 2020 onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Water Tanker Shuttle service</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase</td>
<td>2021-04-01</td>
<td>Staff will include training for tanker shuttle accreditation in the 2019 UBCM fire Department Grant. Training to commence Spring/Summer 2020, with accreditation taking place in the fall of 2020 or spring of 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehall extraction systems - Diesel particulates</td>
<td>2017-04-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-04-30</td>
<td>Fire Services staff and the RDCK Safety Advisor are working to inform how WorkSafe compliance can be met for 2020. A report will be provided to Board in November or December 2019 outlining options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehall equipment inventory</td>
<td>2018-04-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase</td>
<td>2021-04-01</td>
<td>This work will continue once vacant positions in Fire Services are filled; work has not commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch infrastructure upgrades</td>
<td>2018-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-10-01</td>
<td>Coverage survey to be completed by fall of 2020. Spring 2020 RFP for radio system maintenance planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish contract - fire equipment testing</td>
<td>2016-04-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-01</td>
<td>This important item will be addressed in 2020 once staff a rehired for vacant fire services positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Service contract - fire trucks</td>
<td>2016-04-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-01</td>
<td>This important item will be addressed in 2020 once staff a rehired for vacant fire services positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Operating Guidelines</td>
<td>2016-01-10</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
<td>Operational Guideline Section 1: Safety is being released at the end of September both digitally and in hardcopy to all fire services staff and volunteers. Remaining sections of the Operational Guidelines will be completed and released by the end of 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firehall and equipment Asset Management</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2021-04-01</td>
<td>Fire halls are beginning the process of listing their assets during the 2020 budget process. Fire Services staff will be working with the RDCK Project Managers to determine building condition assessments for our fire stations. Software for the inventory and management of assets to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual aid and collaboration with other regional districts</td>
<td>2018-09-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-02-01</td>
<td>4th quarter 2019 - fire contracts and mutual aid agreements are under review for Jan 1 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire training grounds upgrade</td>
<td>2018-09-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2021-08-01</td>
<td>Currently fire fighters are using the live fire training center at Selkirk College. The Selkirk College space does not come with classroom or washroom access. Both can be rented from Selkirk College at a high additional expense. This space also does not provide equipment storage. Staff are exploring options for training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness program for firefighters</td>
<td>2018-09-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2021-01-01</td>
<td>Longer term project. Resources required to establish. Some support available to Firefighters under the EFAP and CISM programs. Future opportunities to strengthen the program will be reviewed. Hindered due to reduced staffing from turnover, once staffing is restablished this will receive a fullsome review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department Group Purchasing</td>
<td>2016-01-10</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-12-01</td>
<td>This is an ongoing priority; once staff capacity is increased this can be addressed in a fullsome manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Protection Program (SPU) upgrades</td>
<td>2016-10-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution,Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2018-04-01</td>
<td>Extra equipment has been purchased: Two Type 2 SPU Units are ready for deployment. A third Unit does not currently meet Type 2 or 3 specs and would require additional investment to bring to spec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change First Responder legislation to allow RDCK firefighters to deliver higher levels of care</td>
<td>2018-09-01</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%- 80% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-11-01</td>
<td>Working group established. Accontract with ATACC group for clinical governance and medical direction is being looked at by staff. A letter from medical oversight recommending first responders be allowed to use endorsements that are currently not part of the EMA endorsement process will be part of the report to Board. Board report for medical oversight/clinical governance and endorsements will be available for October or November Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playbook training requirements</td>
<td>2016-01-10</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%- 80% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-07-01</td>
<td>Each firehall is at a different progression level. A detailed report was made In Camera at September Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighter rehabilitation trailer</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement</td>
<td>2019-04-26</td>
<td>Trailer has been purchased (Dec 13, 2020) Designs are near completion. Contractors are being sought. Overhaul and refit of trailer are on hold due to fiscal restraints within the department. Trailer will be used to deploy side by side all terrain vehicles to assist RDCK crews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Protection Specialist (SPS) team</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Deputy Fire Chief</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-08-01</td>
<td>Fire did not proceed in 2020; there was no demand for Structure Protection Specialists from the Office of the Fire Commissioner. 2020 Office of the Fire Commissioner policy will inform if this is required for future wildfire seasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
<td>Board Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive Firefighter training records system</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Deputy Fire Chief</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area J, Area K</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-05-01</td>
<td>Hiring a temporary staff member to complete this project; Matt Carmichael (finance) has been seconded to facilitate this. All fire fighter records of training from College of the Rockies are now in a centralized database. Tracking of recurrent training will require an upgrade of the current records management system FDM. Options will be presented to Board in the fall of 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department HAZMAT response</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Deputy Fire Chief</td>
<td>Water Protection and Servicacy</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2021-07-01</td>
<td>This initiative would support a regional hazmat team staffed by RDCK volunteer firefighters. This service would ensure that collectively the RDCK Fire Service can safely and effectively enact a response to a HAZMAT event. Medium Priority - no further work able to be carried out at the moment; hindered due to staffing turnover; will commence once hiring takes place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPU Team leader training</td>
<td>2018-12-13</td>
<td>Deputy Fire Chief</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-05-31</td>
<td>SPU team leader training is booked for May and June 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lardeau Valley Community Emergency Response Meeting</td>
<td>2019-12-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-05-01</td>
<td>Current Status: Meeting with Emerg Resp players in the LV discussed with D Watson. Currently awaiting list of participants from D Borsos Possible Barriers: Scheduling Next steps: Book meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 ESS IT Upgrades</td>
<td>2019-12-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Decision of ROCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2021-02-28</td>
<td>Current Status: Board Report coming in January 2020 to get approval to apply. Prov is rolling out new online registration for ESS services that will require our volunteers to have access to internet to manage registrations. Possible Barriers: Not approved by Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Emergency Communications Plan</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80% - 90% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-05-01</td>
<td>Current Status: Draft completed. To be mailed out to partner munis for comment Possible Barriers: Comments from munis Milestones: Draft approval from munis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority evacuation planning for highest risk communities in the RD - UBCM Grant Application</td>
<td>2018-11-30</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area A, Area D, Area E, Area I, Area J, Area K, Town of Creston</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-07-01</td>
<td>Current Status: Consultant has begun data gathering and completed field trips to each of the 7 communities. Possible Barriers: None Next Milestone(1): Initial findings draft of plans then to meet with key stakeholders in the communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 EOC staffing and training ANNUAL</td>
<td>2019-10-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-06-01</td>
<td>Status: Staff refreshers will be held in spring 2020 prior to exercises Possible Barriers: Staff time commitment Next Milestone(s): Set dates for exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Fuel Treatments</td>
<td>2016-08-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project requested by individual Director(s), Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Consultant procurement, Contractor procurement, Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning</td>
<td>2038-12-31</td>
<td>Current Status: Funding has been approved for Queens Bay, Selous, and Trozzo treatments. Possible Barriers: Social impact of work in Selous (adjacent to Nelson) Next Milestone(s): Going to market for FM and Contractor to complete the projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RDCK Q4 2019 Open Quarterly Report**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Initiative Name</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Responsible Manager</th>
<th>Board Strategic Priority</th>
<th>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</th>
<th>Applicable Areas of RDCK</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Board Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire Risk Reduction Group Pilot Project</td>
<td>2019-04-11</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2022-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRESMART _Community recognition program 2019</td>
<td>2012-04-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-04-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRESMART - Home partners program 2019</td>
<td>2017-07-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction (ICLR)/FireSmart Demo</td>
<td>2019-06-19</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Town of Creston, Village of Salmo, Village of Kaslo, City of Castlegar, Village of Nakusp, All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>1% to 10% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire - Asset management Phase 1</td>
<td>2017-07-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%- 80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-04-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Plan Revision</td>
<td>2016-01-10</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2018-05-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Wildfire Protection Plans - Updates + Public consultations</td>
<td>2015-01-01</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td>Wildfire Management</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-07-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Support</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Contractor procurement, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Report and Policy</td>
<td>2019-04-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Planning</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Decision of ROCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2019-10-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Water System Proposal &amp; Water Governance</td>
<td>2018-04-19</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>In active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>2019-02-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%- 80% complete</td>
<td>Consultant procurement</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Review - Nelson, Area F and Defined Area E Recreation</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Consultant procurement</td>
<td>2020-10-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space Selection</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Committee assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Consultant procurement</td>
<td>2020-06-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Visitor Centre</td>
<td>2017-01-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Municipality Status for Area E</td>
<td>2017-03-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Governance Review</td>
<td>2012-06-01</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval, Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2018-12-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission member survey</td>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-02-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Support Policy</td>
<td>2019-08-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>5% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreacres No Hunting or Discharge of Firearm Bylaw Survey</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-08-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service Funding Review</td>
<td>2019-07-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Central RR Subregion, West RR Subregion</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-07-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Permit Regulatory Bylaw</td>
<td>2017-10-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending, in active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2020-01-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Permit Service Establishment</td>
<td>2019-05-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Area E, Area H</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Creston Fire Service Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>2019-09-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>1 to 10% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations, Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Fire-Service Case Analysis</td>
<td>2017-02-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s), Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>80% to 90% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-08-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston and Area Transit Service Review</td>
<td>2019-01-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area C, Town of Creston</td>
<td>1 to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I Noise Control Bylaw Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2018-08-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-02-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area H Public Opinion Survey re: Dog Control, Noise Control and Unsightly Premises Bylaws</td>
<td>2019-03-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area H</td>
<td>60% to 80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-02-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playmor Junction Transit Hub Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2019-03-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area E, Area H, Area I, Area J, Area K, City of Castlegar, City of Nelson</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Decision of RDCK Committee or Board is pending</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management - Facility Data Inventory Project</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2021-09-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Procurement and Policy Update</td>
<td>2019-11-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-07-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 West Kootenay Minor Transit Betterment Projects</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project construction phase</td>
<td>2019-09-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kootenay Transit 5 Year Plan</td>
<td>2018-08-11</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Area D, Area E, Area F, Area G, Area H, Area I, Area J, Area K, Village of Salmo, Village of Kaslo, City of Castlegar, City of Nelson, Village of Slocan, Village of Nakusp, Village of Silverton, Village of New Denver, Multi Regional</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Creek Fire - Increase to Requisition</td>
<td>2018-02-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s), Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area B, Town of Creston</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Delayed pending action by key stakeholder in active negotiations with affected parties</td>
<td>2019-11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ymir Cemetery Service Establishment</td>
<td>2017-06-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s), Project included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Proclamation Request Policy</td>
<td>2019-05-16</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2019-06-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Records Management Software</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-90% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Species Bylaw Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2018-07-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Food security and Agriculture</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Works Fund Policy Update</td>
<td>2018-05-17</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2019-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Recreation Program Waivers and Consent Forms</td>
<td>2018-05-17</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Guidelines and Process Improvements</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>40% to 60% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKBRHD Policy Manual</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Board or Committee requested as action item, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Multi Regional</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Website Improvements-Phase One</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Funding decision is pending</td>
<td>2019-12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Policies re: Alcohol Consumption on RDCK Property</td>
<td>2018-04-24</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referendum Support Policy</td>
<td>2018-06-21</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service Bylaw Review</td>
<td>2018-05-02</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Water Protection and Advocacy</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Area A, Area B, Area D, Area E, Area G, Area H, Area J, Area K, Town of Creston</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Economic Development Commission Bylaw update</td>
<td>2018-01-18</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Updates Related to Area A Parks</td>
<td>2018-04-05</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Recreation, Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Project requested by individual Director(s), Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2019-09-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of Authority Bylaw</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20%-40% complete</td>
<td>Research and data gathering phase, Stakeholder consultation phase</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK Communications Strategy</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated RDCK Involvement at Community Events</td>
<td>2018-04-17</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-08-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Procedures Policy</td>
<td>2018-05-10</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-03-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK Branding Guidelines</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>60%-80% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation for internal approval</td>
<td>2020-06-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Bylaw</td>
<td>2018-03-19</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Delayed pending action by key stakeholder</td>
<td>2019-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I Child Care Study - Phase Two</td>
<td>2018-11-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Not aligned with a Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Board assigned by resolution, Project requested by individual Director(s)</td>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>100% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-01-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative standards for ROCK Commissions and Committees</td>
<td>2018-01-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project/ Initiative recommended by staff, Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-09-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Purchase Order Module</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>Mgr. Finance</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%-99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timesheets application in Project Management module</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>Mgr. Finance</td>
<td>Part of ROCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>1% to 20% complete</td>
<td>Project scoping and initial investigations</td>
<td>2020-06-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td>Board Strategic Priority</td>
<td>Project Drivers</td>
<td>Applicable Areas of RDCK</td>
<td>Project Completion Status</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Anticipated Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Costing Module</td>
<td>2018-04-15</td>
<td>Mgr. Finance</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Project design phase</td>
<td>2020-12-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services Safety Management System</td>
<td>2019-04-08</td>
<td>Mgr. HR</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>20% to 40% complete</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultation phase, Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2020-11-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Creston IT support</td>
<td>2018-02-15</td>
<td>Mgr. IT</td>
<td>Coordinated Service Delivery</td>
<td>Project was included in approved current year Work plan</td>
<td>Town of Creston</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Options evaluation and report preparation</td>
<td>2019-04-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Server upgrades</td>
<td>2018-12-01</td>
<td>Mgr. IT</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project was added to Work plan mid-year</td>
<td>All Electoral Areas</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2019-05-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Security Training</td>
<td>2018-01-15</td>
<td>Mgr. IT</td>
<td>Part of RDCK Core Services</td>
<td>Project/Initiative recommended by staff</td>
<td>Entire RDCK</td>
<td>80%- 99% complete</td>
<td>Project implementation or commissioning phase</td>
<td>2018-04-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis Bylaw Review</td>
<td>Mgr. Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite communication provision</td>
<td>GM Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyro Pool Operating Agreement</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena roof support wall repair project</td>
<td>Mgr. Castlegar Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of VOIP Phone System</td>
<td>Mgr. Castlegar Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Center Wall lights (LED)</td>
<td>Mgr. Castlegar Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Software Administrator Position Evaluation</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Inventory</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Hall Records Disposition</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Creston Fire Service Case Analysis</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Dividend Fund Administration</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEO Recruitment for Creston</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Emergency Declaration</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Intern/state of the RDCK</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDMP Stream 1 Regional Flood Hazard Risk Assessment</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual WaterSmart Program</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Coast Guard Response Seacan</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay Food Policy Council</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury Village Reservoir Structural Banding</td>
<td>Utilities Operations Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharefile Implementation</td>
<td>Mgr. IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Initiative Name</td>
<td>Responsible Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Soil Policy Update</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson HHW year-round depot</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley SRM</td>
<td>Mgr. Resource Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson Metering Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Mgr. Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event Permit Service Establishment</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 West Kootenay Minor Transit Betterment Projects</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Creek Fire -Increase to Requisition</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ymir Cemetery Service Establishment</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galena Trail Bridge/Trestle Replacement</td>
<td>Mgr. Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Website Improvements- Phase One</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Economic Development Commission Bylaw update</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaw Updates Related to Area A Parks</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Communications Strategy</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Bylaw</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 ESS IT Upgrades</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRESMART - Home partners program 2019</td>
<td>Emergency Program Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Eddy Regional Park Private Land Acquisition</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Land Corporation (Incl. Cottonwood Lake Regional Park) Private Land</td>
<td>GM Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Curling Club - Facility Use Agreements</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Junior Hockey Society Agreement</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Education Centre</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Room Flooring and equipment upgrades</td>
<td>Mgr. Creston Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena Ice shed door replacement</td>
<td>Mgr. Castlegar Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Arena Brine Expansion Tank Repairs</td>
<td>Mgr. Nelson Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Skate Park Kiosk</td>
<td>Mgr. Castlegar Rec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I Child Care Study - Phase Two</td>
<td>Mgr. Corporate Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Intern/state of the RDCK</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kootenay Food Policy Council</td>
<td>GM Development Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ID</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>ELECTORAL AREA</td>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>PHASE</td>
<td>PHASE COMPLETION (0-100%)</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS TO DECEMBER 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP795-100</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>CDCC Phase 1 Skate Park</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>S224</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Construction complete. Minor deficiencies to be corrected. August 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP938-100</td>
<td>Fire + Emergency Services</td>
<td>North Shore Fire Hall - Well Completion</td>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>S134</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Work complete. Working through issues regarding water quality, testing and licencing. November 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP939-100</td>
<td>Fire + Emergency Services</td>
<td>Harrop Fire Hall Structural Modifications + Building Condition Assessment</td>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>S141</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Work Complete. Confirm replacement value of building. November 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP932-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Creston Landfill - Valley Infill and Drainage Works</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>S186</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Work Substantially Complete. December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP889-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Recycle BC Changeover - East</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>S186</td>
<td>6Procurement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Initiating high priority work at priority sites. May 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP879-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Recycle BC Changeover - Central</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>S187</td>
<td>6Procurement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Initiating high priority work at priority sites. May 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP886-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Recycle BC Changeover - West</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>S188</td>
<td>6Procurement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Initiating high priority work at priority sites. May 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Boswell Transfer Station Landline Installation</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>S189</td>
<td>2Assessment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Wait until 2020. Telus is bring fibre to area? May 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP795-100</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>CDCC Storage Garage</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>S224</td>
<td>7Construction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Working on building permit application to Creston March 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP795-100</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>CDCC Phase 2-3 Site Upgrades</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>S224</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Completion of deficiencies in spring 2020 May 15, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVR162-100</td>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>Castlegar Rec Centre Building Condition assessment</td>
<td>Area J</td>
<td>S227</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Work Complete. Awaiting review comments from Jim and team. November 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP916-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Erickson Water Distribution System - Antique Mobile Home Park Relocation</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>S250</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Work Substantially Complete. November 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP887-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Balfour Transfer Station Septic/Washroom Upgrades</td>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>S187</td>
<td>2Assessment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Construction underway. January 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP914-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Erickson Water Distribution System Fire Hydrants</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>S250</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Project complete and transferred to Operations. December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP915-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Erickson Water Distribution System - Metering</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>S250</td>
<td>8Closeout</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Project complete and transferred to Operations. December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP807-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Edgewood Reservoir and Pumphouse</td>
<td>Area K</td>
<td>S253</td>
<td>7Construction</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Work Substantially Complete. Spring deficiencies. April 30, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR500-101</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>NDMP Stream 2</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>S100</td>
<td>4Detailed Design</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Fieldwork and modelling is actively underway. April 30, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>HB Tailings Facility Closure</td>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>S187</td>
<td>6Procurement</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NRFP currently out and closing on January 24, 2020. December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP834-100</td>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>Corn Creek Dike Repairs</td>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>S100</td>
<td>10Hold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>On Hold until conclusion of NDMP Stream 2 Study. Re-evaluate in spring of 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP917-100</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Erickson Water Distribution System Replacement - Tooze Road</td>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>S250</td>
<td>10Hold</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Tendered and rejected bids due to high cost. Evaluate undertaking in 2020 if additional funds are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPICAL PROJECT PROGRESSION**
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* Project Completed Within Last Quarter
SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek Board direction to submit an application for the 2020 stream of the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) to purchase Emergency Support Services (ESS) IT equipment for the purpose of accessing the new online ESS registration system currently being developed by Emergency Management BC (EMBC).

The new ESS online registration system aims to streamline processes so evacuated individuals can access services more easily and efficiently. The new system will be implemented in Spring of 2020 and will require ESS volunteers to register evacuees using computers with an internet connection, as opposed to the conventional paper forms.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Under the Emergency Program Act, regional districts are responsible for responding to emergencies in their jurisdiction, including the coordination of ESS.

The RDCK Emergency Program provides a level of support to incidents proportionate to the complexity and seriousness of the situation.

- Level 1: A small localized event such as a fire affecting one or two households; usually less than 12 people. The IT kits will not be used for this level of activation.
- Level 2: A significant event affecting more than 12 people, such as an apartment fire. A Reception Centre is established – usually for a short duration. The IT kits will be used in the Reception Centre. An EOC will be established.
- Level 3: A major emergency, such as large scale flooding or interface wildfires involving large scale evacuations. More than one Reception Centre may be established. Duration of operation may last days or weeks. The IT kits will be used in the Reception Centres. An EOC will be established.

The RDCK Emergency Management Program maintains a regional contract with the Red Cross for provision of Level 1 ESS. Level 2 and 3 ESS requirements are coordinated through the RDCK Regional Emergency Operations Centre (EOC), supported by EMBC and the Red Cross.

When evacuations are required, Reception Centres and Group Lodging sites are set up by ESS volunteers to welcome the evacuees. The new online registration system will be accessible to the evacuees allowing for self-registration resulting in shorter wait times in the Reception Centres. The ESS Volunteers will then be required to manage the registrations online.
The IT equipment will form kits that will include: 5 computers, a printer and additional support gear. It will be deployed through the region, when required, to set up a Registration Centre.

With the RDCK’s vast territory, and to allow for a timely response, it will be necessary to purchase and prepare multiple registration kits, which will then be pre-positioned strategically through the region, similarly to the ESS trailers that contain the necessary equipment to set up Group Lodging Centres.

**SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS**

**a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan:</th>
<th>☒ YES</th>
<th>☐ NO</th>
<th>Financial Plan Amendment:</th>
<th>☐ YES</th>
<th>☒ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required:</td>
<td>☐ YES</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d:</td>
<td>☐ YES</td>
<td>☒ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total budget for this project is $25,000 and will be 100% funded by UBCM.

**b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):**

The online registration system, with the ESS modernization project is implemented by EMBC.

**c. Environmental Considerations:**

None.

**d. Social Considerations:**

Our environment is changing in ways that will challenge us, and it is important to ensure the resilience of our communities. Emergencies can strike at any time. In the RDCK, the three most likely emergencies to occur are forest fires, floods, and hazardous materials spills. The ESS modernization project with the new registration system, will allow for a quicker evacuee registration process by enabling evacuees to self-register. The ESS modernization project with the implementation of the new online registration system, will help build local capacity to provide ESS services.

**e. Economic Considerations:**

With the support of the RDCK IT department, the equipment will be purchased via local contracts.

**f. Communication Considerations:**

EMBC will be rolling out a communications plan for the new registration system. RDCK will work with EMBC to ensure the messaging is forwarded to our residents via established channels.

**g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:**

Time investment by resources in the Emergency Program and IT departments to research and manage the grant process. The implementation of the new system will involve preparing and coordinating ESS training sessions that will be lead by the Emergency Program Admin. Once the kits are operational, RDCK staff will position the kits strategically through the RDCK with the Emergency Program Coordinators in Nakusp, Creston and Nelson.

**h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:**
Building Resilient Communities.

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

Option 1:

That Board direct staff to apply to the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) Emergency Support Services stream to purchase 3 complete IT kits consisting of 5 devices each and provide training for ESS volunteers on the use of the devices and the new online registration forms.

Pro: The kits would be stationed in RDCK offices and maintained by the local Emergency Program Coordinators.

Pro: In the eventuality of a Level 2 or 3 activation, having 3 kits stationed across the RDCK provides quick response with surge capacity of 15 total devices.

Con: The initial investment is covered by UBCM, however the EM Program will have to plan for future replacement via reserves – estimated at $1500/year

Option 2:

That Board direct staff to apply to the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) Emergency Support Services stream to purchase 2 complete IT kits consisting of 5 devices each and provide training for ESS volunteers on the use of the devices and the new online registration forms.

Pro: This option would reduce the future replacement costs to $1000/year.

Con: This option would not allow for a timely deployment of the kits. Unless deployed by air, the kits could take 3 hours to make it to the activated registration centre.

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)

That Board direct staff to apply to the UBCM Community Emergency Preparedness Fund (CEPF) Emergency Support Services stream to purchase 3 complete IT kits consisting of 5 devices each and provide training for ESS volunteers on the use of the devices and the new online registration forms.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature: [Signature]

Name: Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager
CONCURRENCE
Chief Administrative Officer
Initials:
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SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Board regarding the final totals of the community development grants (CDGs) each electoral area has committed to wildfire mitigation projects since 2017.

Wildfire fuel mitigation was recognized as a priority of the Board in 2014. Since then a number of projects have been started and are now coming to completion. The process to complete a wildfire fuel mitigation project on crown land includes completing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) to identify areas of interest, identifying highest risk areas and developing a fuel mitigation prescription, and finally, implementing the prescription using a multitude of methods. This whole process takes years, and as such, funds committed to the projects by local and provincial governments are not withdrawn until the projects are completed to ensure amounts are accurate. In some cases this will mean that the amount of CD funding required is lower than originally expected.

2019 was a year where many of these projects were completed and final reporting submitted to provincial authorities. This report provides the amounts each electoral area has committed to these projects in the past that has not been withdrawn.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

Over the last number of years the RDCK has been able to access grant funding partially based on the contributions by electoral area directors. The table below provides information on projects including final costs and amount of grant funds leveraged by electoral area contributions.

Common Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWPP</td>
<td>Community Wildfire Protection Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFT</td>
<td>Operational Fuel Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rx</td>
<td>Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Treatment Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wildfire Mitigation Community Development Grants  
January 16, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Final Report Project Cost</th>
<th>UBCM Grant</th>
<th>Original Approved Amount</th>
<th>Electoral Area Contribution</th>
<th>Other Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>UBCM</td>
<td>CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell (QFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$96,759.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$87,083.10</td>
<td>$87,083.10</td>
<td>$4,837.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riondel (QFT)</td>
<td>547/15</td>
<td>$199,959.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$179,963.10</td>
<td>$179,963.10</td>
<td>$9,998.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$183,553.20</td>
<td>$18,758.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D CWPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argenta and Larheau (QFT)</td>
<td>274/16</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury (Rx)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$165,600.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$149,040.00</td>
<td>$149,040.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo TU2 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$20,010.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo TU3 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$29,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$21,750.00</td>
<td>$29,325.00</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$30,360.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howser TU1 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,005.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Final Report Project Cost</th>
<th>UBCM Grant</th>
<th>Original Approved Amount</th>
<th>Electoral Area Contribution</th>
<th>Other Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>UBCM</td>
<td>CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E CWPP Update</td>
<td>244/15</td>
<td>$20,500.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$10,250.00</td>
<td>$10,250.00</td>
<td>$5,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrop and Procter (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$97,580.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$87,822.00</td>
<td>$87,822.00</td>
<td>$4,879.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E - Morning Mountain and Blewett Fire (OFT)</td>
<td>320/15</td>
<td>$138,182.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$124,364.00</td>
<td>$159,840.00</td>
<td>$6,909.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redfish (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$68,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$51,000.00</td>
<td>$68,310.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrop Procter TU2 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$43,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$32,250.00</td>
<td>$43,125.00</td>
<td>$5,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnington Regional Park (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$23,400.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$21,060.00</td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstone (Rx)</td>
<td>578/17</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$6,750.00</td>
<td>$9,375.00</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproutie Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>$24,150.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallwood (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$8,280.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area G CWPP Update</td>
<td>56/17</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salmo $1,875.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Final Report</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>UBCM Grant</th>
<th>Original Approved Amount</th>
<th>Electoral Area</th>
<th>Other Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>% Funded</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UBCM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area H North CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$51,500.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area H South CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trexco Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>58/17</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$11,250.00</td>
<td>$11,250.00</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,375.00</td>
<td>$34,375.00</td>
<td>$6,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I CWPP Update</td>
<td>323/16</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glade TU1 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$9,750.00</td>
<td>$13,455.00</td>
<td>$2,990.00</td>
<td>$1,495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
<td>$67,850.00</td>
<td>$6,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area J CWPP Update</td>
<td>56/17</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$22,500.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area K CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$40,001.44</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$30,001.88</td>
<td>$30,001.08</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton (QFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$82,960.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$74,664.00</td>
<td>$74,700.36</td>
<td>$4,150.00</td>
<td>$4,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood 2013 (QFT)</td>
<td>230/12</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$370,565.26</td>
<td>$370,711.44</td>
<td>$14,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,280,948.08</td>
<td>$1,440,811.95</td>
<td>$118,368.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

**a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Plan Amendment:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals rec’d:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds that will be transferred from Community Development Grants will reimburse the Emergency Program for expenditures made over the lifetime of the given project.

**b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):**
None

**c. Environmental Considerations:**
None

**d. Social Considerations:**
None

**e. Economic Considerations:**
None

**f. Communication Considerations:**
There is opportunity to communicate the amount of grant funds that have been leveraged through the strategic use of Community Development Grants (11:1 dollars received to dollars invested).

**g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:**
None

**h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:**
Wildfire Management

### SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

N/A

### SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
That the Board direct staff to transfer funds from Community Development Grant funds as per previous resolutions to support wildfire fuel mitigation work to Service A101 in the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Electorl Area Contribution Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area A CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Boswell (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$4,837.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riordan - UBCM SWPI (OFT)</td>
<td>547/15</td>
<td>$9,997.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area B CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area C CWPP Update</td>
<td>579/17</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area D CWPP</td>
<td>274/16</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Argenta and Lardeau (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$8,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Woodbury (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Kaslo TU2 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Kaslo TU3 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Glacier Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Horseshoe TU1 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area E CWPP Update</td>
<td>244/15</td>
<td>$5,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Harrop and Procter (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$4,879.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E - Morning Mountain and Blewett Fire (OFT)</td>
<td>320/15</td>
<td>$6,909.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Redfish (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Harrop Procter TU2 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$5,375.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Electorl Area Contribution Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Bonnington Regional Park (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$1,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Johnstone (Rx)</td>
<td>578/17</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Sprout Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Smallwood (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area G CWPP Update</td>
<td>56/17</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA H</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area H North CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area H South CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Trozzo Creek (Rx)</td>
<td>58/17</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area I CWPP Update</td>
<td>323/16</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Glade TU1 (Rx)</td>
<td>134/18</td>
<td>$1,495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA J</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area J CWPP Update</td>
<td>56/17</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA K</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBCM-SWPI - Area K CWPP Update</td>
<td>261/17</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPI - Burton (OFT)</td>
<td>528/16</td>
<td>$4,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood 2013 (OFT)</td>
<td>230/12</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,
Signature: [Signature]

Name: Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCURRENCE</th>
<th>Initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>[Initials]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

Board Report

Date of Report: January 1, 2020
Date & Type of Meeting: January 16, 2020 Open Regular Board Meeting
Author: C Johnson, Emergency Program Manager
Subject: EMERGENCY PROGRAM ACT MODERNIZATION
File: 14-7610-01

SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Board regarding the provincial project to modernize the Emergency Program Act.

Emergency Management B.C. (EMBC) is modernizing the Emergency Program Act (EPA) to support more effective management of emergencies in B.C. by incorporating international best practices, including the United Nations (UN) Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (Sendai Framework); the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (the Declaration); and the draft principles that guide the Province’s relationship with Indigenous Peoples. ¹

Starting October 28, 2019 a consultation period was opened to publically discuss the modernization project and what changes would/should/could be included. To guide this process EMBC released a discussion paper outlining proposed policy direction for and inclusions to the legislation and has solicited feedback from elected officials and emergency management practitioners. This feedback window closes January 31, 2020.

While this modernization will progress the province as a whole to a more resilient future, it is likely to require an increase in level of effort and investment from local authorities (LAs). Some of the proposed changes that will directly affect LA emergency plans include:

- Increased requirement of plans (focus on mitigation plans)
- Increased focus on prescription of plan content
- Increased focus on critical operators preparedness and exercising with LAs
- New focus on compliance with proposed auditing process
- New focus on business continuity plans for organizations

While there is little reference in the discussion paper as to how these changes might be supported by the province, now is the time to ensure the voice of LAs is heard.

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND / ANALYSIS

The discussion paper presents the proposed changes by comparing them to the old legislation or identified issue. Rather than repeating what has been included in the paper, the following section will provide some thoughts on items that emergency practitioners regionally have identified. It is worth

¹ https://engage.gov.bc.ca/govttogetherbc/consultation/emergency-program-act-modernization/
noting that this is not attempting to be an exhaustive list, and certainly recognizes that individual electoral areas or municipalities will identify items that aren’t included in the list below. For ease of reference to the discussion paper the same section headings will be used.

KEY DEFINITIONS (p. 14-17)

Six key definitions are proposed for change or addition to the Act: Emergency, Local Authority, Mitigation (new), Preparedness, Response, and Recovery. Following is feedback on each proposed definition. It is also noted that Critical Infrastructure Operator needs to be defined (see also pages 33-37 of the Discussion Document).

**Emergency**: It is proposed to include the potential for damage to significant Indigenous sites and the environment as qualifiers for something to be considered an emergency. While this is broadly supported, this will require close work with local First Nations as well as clear identification and delineation of what constitutes “damage” to the environment and how that is established.

**Local Authority**: It is proposed under the Act to add the ability for the Minister to prescribe by regulation a new “Local Authority” for the purposes of undertaking some or all emergency management functions, and this could be a group of municipalities, treaty or non-treaty first nations and electoral areas.

**Mitigation**: It is proposed to add Mitigation to the emergency management responsibilities, requiring local authorities (and others) to take, ‘proactive steps...to eliminate the hazard or reduce the severity or potential impact of the hazard before it occurs’. While this is broadly supported, mitigation is not currently a responsibility of emergency programs under the Act and it is not within the scope of a program’s authority to implement changes that would require a whole of government approach, including changes to planning and building bylaw (local) and subdivision approval process and building code (provincial). Locally we can make changes, but need to better understand how the province will support mitigation in their actions and evaluate our performance.

**Preparedness**: Definition broadly supported.

**Emergency Response**: Definition is broadly supported, but if actions to support recovery are to be included in the response phase, then this requirement needs to come with provincial funding to enable funding of community recovery and organizational business continuity planning.

**Recovery**: It is proposed to move from the current definition of recovery to one that meets a standard of “build back better”. The definition requires local authorities to plan for recovery that could ‘withstand a potential future event, or, when feasible, improve them to increase resilience in individuals, families, organizations, and communities.” While the philosophical goals of this definition are supported, local authorities do not currently have the means or expertise to take advantage of the new wording in the legislation. More detail on how this gap will be supported provincially and federally is required.

**ENHANCING CONFIDENCE IN THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM** (p. 22-25)

**Transparency** – Establish a legislative requirement for the Province to centrally house and provide transparent data on hazard, risk and vulnerability assessments, or mitigation planning documents which
are conducted or prepared by other bodies (provincial ministries, Crown corporations and agencies; Local Authorities; and critical infrastructure operators).

Comments
- General concern over the security/access to documents such as hazard, risk, and vulnerability assessments (HRVAs), mitigation plans, etc...
- Appreciate having access to and sharing HRVA and mitigation documents with other agencies/organizations but must understand what groups would have access
- Curious what will occur if/when documents from different agencies regarding the same area have competing findings – will there be a resolution process?

Quality Assurance – Require provincial ministries, Crown corporations and agencies, Local Authorities, and critical infrastructure owners/operators to register their emergency management plans with EMBC; and Enable EMBC to audit emergency management plans. In the spirit of continuous improvement, audit results would be shared with the planning body and made public.

Comments
- Auditing processes demand additional attention from staff
  - Auditing cycle?
  - Findings resolution process?
  - Consistency of application between LAs, Agencies, Critical Infrastructure operators?
  - Certification of auditors?

MITIGATION FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES (p. 27-28)

Building & Development – Require Local Authorities, and the Province (through the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s subdivision approval authority in unincorporated areas) to give greater consideration of current and future risk for new development approvals in hazardous areas; and, require sustainable long-term mitigation measures when building and development is approved in hazardous areas.

Comments
- What does “greater consideration of current and future risk” look like?
  - This would require regularly updated hazard mapping to be completed
  - Is there an identified level of risk that is acceptable?
  - How to ensure QPs are actually qualified to make assessments
  - How far will the hazard/risk assessment go for a proposed site? To a watershed level? Take into account cascading events (landslide causes debris flow)?

Hazard & Risk Identification – Include legislative and regulatory requirements for Local Authorities to identify, understand and assess hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities, and establish associated mitigation plans for risks and consequences.

Comments
- Accurate mitigation plans require current and accurate mapping. How regularly will mapping be updated and funded?
Mapping is currently being created locally via grant funding, but how will it be updated in the future? Will the province take the lead?

- How are identified existing risks to built environment to be addressed? Hazard mitigation or structural protection can be prohibitively expensive.

**PREPAREDNESS FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES** (p. 28-29)

*Standardized Programs and Plans* – Establish a comprehensive list of requirements including: hazard, risk, and vulnerability assessment; mitigation plans; response; recovery; business continuity plans; training; exercising; and a review cycle; and through regulation, provide detailed program and plan content requirements.

**Comments**

- Business continuity plans to ensure continued provision of essential services during emergencies will require additional resources to develop and maintain

**Collaborative Planning & Partnerships** – Require Local Authorities to provide plans to neighbouring jurisdictions (Local Authorities and First Nations), to the Province, and stakeholders such as critical infrastructure operators, school districts, and health authorities and consider any feedback; enable Local Authorities and First Nations to enter into agreements with one another for the purposes of integrated or multi-jurisdictional plans; and introduce a requirement for Local Authorities preparing emergency management plans to consult with First Nations. Consultation standards for Local Authorities could be specified in regulation or guidelines.

- Under the current EMA regulations having pre-established MOUs with other jurisdictions can result in associated response claims being denied by the province. Ex – if Nelson and RDCK have an MOU to support each other by sharing personnel, the province views that as a natural course of business and therefore not a response cost that is eligible for recovery from the province.

**RESPONSE FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES** (p. 19-22)

*State of Local Emergency (SOLE) Durations* – The duration of a SOLE be set at 14 days, with extensions of 14 days at a time approved by the Minister or designate. Extensions may include changes to the geographical scope of the SOLE.

**Comments**

- This is supported as it will reduce the amount of administrative work required during emergencies – previously SOLEs were required to be reapplied for every 7 days.

**Continued use of a SOLE** – Introduce a new provision to allow the Minister to grant a Local Authority the use of specific powers for a "transition period" between response and recovery of up to 90 days. A Local Authority would make an application to the Minister, citing what powers are required and demonstrating that they are in the public interest; necessary or desirable to ensure a timely and effective recovery; and proportionate in the circumstances. The Minister could approve multiple extensions, for up to 90 days each. Local Authorities would be required to report publicly on their use of the transition powers.
Comments

- This is widely supported as a 90-day transition period from a SOLE to normalcy will ensure the LA has the applicable authority to meet the needs of recovery without maintaining all the powers under a SOLE, however this should remain flexible as the recovery situation will often change as new data becomes available.

SECTION 3: DETAILED ANALYSIS

a. Financial Considerations – Cost and Resource Allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included in Financial Plan:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Plan Amendment:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Bylaw Required:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Gov’t Approvals req’d:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff will be communicating the need for financial and other resources as the changes are finalized.

b. Legislative Considerations (Applicable Policies and/or Bylaws):

The new EPA will change the legislated responsibilities local governments have for emergency management.

c. Environmental Considerations:

New requirements for hazard mitigation may result in increased focus on the landscape as it pertains to hazard risk.

d. Social Considerations:

e. Economic Considerations:

Business Continuity requirements for local government and other agencies will have a positive effect on the economy during times of emergencies/disaster.

f. Communication Considerations:

Staff will be recommending communications as needed as the changes to the EPA are finalized.

g. Staffing/Departmental Workplan Considerations:

Staff will be communicating the implications of changes once they are finalized.

h. Board Strategic Plan/Priorities Considerations:

SECTION 4: OPTIONS & PROS / CONS

N/A

SECTION 5: RECOMMENDATION(S)
That Board receives this report on the Emergency Program Act Modernization process as information.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature:  
Name: Chris Johnson, Emergency Program Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCURRENCE</th>
<th>Initials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Discretionary Grant Application Form

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>02-Jan-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Employment Services Society</td>
<td>Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
<td>Electoral Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 548, Creston BC V0B 1G0</td>
<td>RCDK Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bd@kes.bc.ca">bd@kes.bc.ca</a></td>
<td>Name of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone No.</strong></td>
<td>Garry Jackman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-428-5655</td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT REQUESTED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Brandy Dyer</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Payable to</th>
<th>** Applicant ✓ Sponsor Organization**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Sponsor Organization</strong></td>
<td>Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay Employment Services Society</td>
<td>Grants will not be provided to individuals or 'for profit' entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address of Sponsor Organization</strong> (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 548, Creston, BC V0B 1G0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

Kootenay Employment Services delivers employment programming to individuals who are unemployed, underemployed or at risk of losing their employment.

Funding will be used for -

To deliver the P.A.R.T.Y. program to students at PCSS. The P.A.R.T.Y. Program is designed to educate students on risk taking behavior including substance use.

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

## Signature of Applicant

Brandy Dyer

## Signature of Sponsor Organization

(if required)

## Authorization

**Signature of Area Director**  
Signed by Email

**AMOUNT APPROVED**  
$500.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Grants Received:</th>
<th>Cheque to be forwarded to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_2014  _2015  _2016</td>
<td>Director ✓ Applicant ✓ Sponsor Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Board Date Resolution # | |
|-------------------------| |
| RDCK-1860 Jun 2017     | |
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**Discretionary Grant Application Form**

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Rod. Gun</td>
<td>January 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)**

Box 1  
Creston BC  
V0A 1R0

**Phone No.**

Traven Auschraft

**Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from**

Electoral Area  B

Municipality  Wall

**Name of Director**

Wall

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**

1500.00

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

**Community Wildlife Conservation Group**

**Funding will be used for**

100th Anniversary Banquet/Dinner / Fundraiser Table Sponsor

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

**Signature of Applicant**

Completed By Director

**Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)**

**Signature of Area Director**

**AMOUNT APPROVED**

1500.00

Previous Grants Received:  
2014  2015  2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:  
Director  Applicant  Sponsor Organization

Board Date  Resolution #

RDCK-1860 Jun 2017
# Discretionary Grant Application Form

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9900
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

**File No. 1860-20-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date of Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cresten Valley Shrine Club</td>
<td><strong>January 5, 2020</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)**
Box 192

**Email**
Cresten BC

**Phone No.**
VCB 1610

**Contact**
Tony James Mark

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

**Funding Payable to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sponsor Organization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name of Sponsor Organization**

**Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)**

---

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**

500.00

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or for profit entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

---

**See Attached Letter**

Funding will be used for:

- Nancy Sayles Annual Shrine Derby

---

**Signature of Applicant**

**Letter Submitted**

---

**Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)**

**AMOUNT APPROVED**

500.00

---

**Previous Grants Received:**
2014  2015  2016

**Cheque to be forwarded to:**
Director  Applicant  Sponsor Organization

**Board Date**

**Resolution #**
## Discretionary Grant Application Form

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**  
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325  

File No. 1860-20-__

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Shrine Club</td>
<td>09-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.O.Box 103, Creston, BC. V0B 1G0</td>
<td>250-428-1895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:malibudt@gmail.com">malibudt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Derick Todd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Payable to</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sponsor Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Director</th>
<th>Tanya Wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT REQUESTED:** $ 1,000.00

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or 'for profit' entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

---

### Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community

Support towards Community Events Popcorn Project

Funding will be used for:

- Helping local families with costs, who need to travel to Shriner's Hospitals for specialized care for children of the Creston Valley,

---

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

---

### Signature of Applicant

Derick Todd  
Digitally signed by Derick Todd  
Date: 2017.12.12 07:15:44 -08'00'

---

### Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)

---

### Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received:  
- 2014 - 2015 - 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:  
□ Director □ Applicant □ Sponsor Organization

AMOUNT APPROVED

$1000.00

Board Date  
Resolution #

---
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Discretionary Grant Application Form

Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

Date of Application: January 5, 2020

Name of Applicant: Kootenay Employment Services
Mailing Address: Box 548, Creston BC V0A 1G0
Email: Brandy.Dyer
Contact: Brandy Dyer

Date of Application: January 5, 2020

AMOUNT REQUESTED: $1,000.00

Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or for profit entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

AMOUNT APPROVED: $1,000.00

Previous Grants Received: 2014 2015 2016
Cheque to be forwarded to: Director _Applicant _Sponsor Organization
Board Date
Resolution #
### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Hospital</td>
<td>11-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>312 15th Ave. N., Bag 3000, Creston, BC, V0B 1G0</td>
<td>250-428-2286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:carolyn.hawton@interiorhealth.ca">carolyn.hawton@interiorhealth.ca</a></td>
<td>Carolyn Hawton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

### Funding Payable to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_☐ Applicant _☒ Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Name of Sponsor Organization**
  - Casey’s Community House

- **Address of Sponsor Organization**
  - PO Box 354; 1136 Canyon Street, Creston, BC, V0B 1G0

AMOUNT REQUESTED $500.00

Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities. Grants will not be provided to individuals or 'for profit' entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

### Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community

Creston Valley Hospital, Interior Health Authority

Funding will be used for:

Creston Valley Hospital hosted a Community Emergency Services Gathering that included BCEHS crews; Creston, Wynndel, Canyon-Lister and West Creston Fire Departments; RCMP

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Applicant</th>
<th>Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>Cheque to be forwarded to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed by Email</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMOUNT APPROVED

$500.00

Previous Grants Received:

2014 2015 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:

DIRECTOR  APPLICANT SPONSOR ORGANIZATION

Board Date

Resolution #
**Discretionary Grant Application Form**

Regional District of Central Kootenay  
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20-___

---

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creston Valley Shrine Club</td>
<td>09-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.O.Box 103, Creston, BC. V0B 1G0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:malibudt@gmail.com">malibudt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>250-428-1895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derick Todd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.*

---

### Funding Payable to

- [ ] Applicant  
- [ ] Sponsor Organization

### Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

Support towards Community Events. 2nd Annual Harvey Sayles Fishing Derby

Helping local families with costs, who need to travel to Shriner's Hospitals for specialized care for children of the Creston Valley,

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

---

### Signature of Applicant

Signed by Email

### Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)

Signed by Email

---

### Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>Signed by Email</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received:  
- ✔ 2014  
- ✔ 2015  
- ✔ 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:  
- [ ] Director  
- [ ] Applicant  
- [ ] Sponsor Organization

Board Date  
Resolution #
# Discretionary Grant Application Form

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**  
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665   Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>December 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
<td>Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from Electoral Area D Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Name of Director Aimee Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMOUNT REQUESTED | 75.60 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Payable to</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community

Funding will be used for:
- payment of advertisements for Area D- Pennywise – Remembrance Day & Christmas Ads

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Applicant</th>
<th>Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.  
Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

**Signature of Applicant**  
**Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)**

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>Signed by Email</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received:  
-2014  -2015  -2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:  
- Director  - Applicant  - Sponsor Organization

Board Date  
Resolution #
Discretionary Grant Application Form

Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transfer to general admin</td>
<td>December 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
<th>Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Phone No.</td>
<td>Electoral Area D Municipality Name of Director Aimee Watson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>AMOUNT REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Payable to</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Sponsor Organization</td>
<td>Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities. Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
<th>Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding will be used for -

- payment of advertisements for Area D – Remembrance Day & Christmas Ads

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Applicant</th>
<th>Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>Signed by Email</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received: 2014 2015 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to: Director Applicant Sponsor Organization

Board Date Resolution #
# Community Development Grant Application

## Regional District of Central Kootenay

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant Information</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date of Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>30-Sep-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutenai Art Therapy Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</td>
<td>Request for Community Development Funding from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 Baker St, Nelson, BC V1L 4H1</td>
<td>Electoral Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:lheisler@kutenaitherapy.com">lheisler@kutenaitherapy.com</a></td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>Name of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Heisler</td>
<td>Ramona Faust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT REQUESTED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250) 352-2264</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Payable to** □ Applicant □ Sponsor Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Sponsor Organization</strong></th>
<th><strong>Address of Sponsor Organization</strong> (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Development Program supports initiatives which further the social, economic and environmental well being of the Regional District's residents and organizations.

### Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

Polka Dot Dragon Lantern Festival, to be held in February, 2020 is a free community festival showcasing local artist and performers.

Funding will be used for:

- offering lantern workshops in schools and to the public preceding the festival, artist and performer fees, materials, event insurance, photographer, and administration fees

### Which funding criterial objectives does this project meet? □ Social □ Economic □ Environmental

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

**Signature of Applicant**

**Signature of Sponsor Organization** (if required)

### Signature of Area Director

Signed by Email  

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AMOUNT APPROVED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Grants Received**

□ 2014 □ 2015 □ 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:

□ Director  □ Applicant  □ Sponsor Organization

**Board Date:**

**Resolution #**

RDCK-1865_Jun 2017
## Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Community Food Centre</td>
<td>02-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602 Silica Street, Nelson BC, V1L 4N1</td>
<td>250 551 0305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew@nelsoncfc.ca">andrew@nelsoncfc.ca</a></td>
<td>Andrew Creighton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**: $1,000.00

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

## Funding Payable to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

The Nelson Community Food Centre runs 4 programs: the Good Food Bank, Food Skills/Cooking Classes, Harvest Rescue and the Garden.

Funding will be used for -

Supporting these 4 programs

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

## Signature of Applicant

[Signature]

## Signature of Sponsor Organization

[Signature] (if required)

## Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Email</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Grants Received:</th>
<th>Cheque to be forwarded to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ 2014 ✔ 2015 ✔ 2016</td>
<td>Director ✔ Applicant ✔ Sponsor Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Date</th>
<th>Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.
## Discretionary Grant Application Form

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6685 Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20-__

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Special Olympics Bowling Team</td>
<td>03-Jan-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
<th>Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c/o 1715 Stanley Street, Nelson, B.C. V1L1R6</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Electoral Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:walgren@telus.net">walgren@telus.net</a></td>
<td>Central Kootenay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone No.</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250-352-7110</td>
<td>Central Kootenay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Name of Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Walgren - Local Coordinator</td>
<td>Ramona Faust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**

Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or 'for profit' entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

### Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

Special Olympics provides opportunities for people with physical and mental disabilities to participate in sports. Currently we have six sports with active members.

Funding will be used for -

*We are applying for funding for our Zone Bowling Team. Each team member must have a collared shirt with the Special Olympic Logos and their names. We have 15 members and rely on community support for uniforms. All our coaches and members are volunteers.*

*Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).*

### Signature of Applicant

Karen Walgren

### Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)

### Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed by Email</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Grants Received:**  
2014 2015 2016

**Cheque to be forwarded to:**  
Director  Applicant  Sponsor Organization

**Board Date**  
Resolution #
# Discretionary Grant Application Form

### Regional District of Central Kootenay

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

---

**Name of Applicant** *(Organization or Society)*  
Our Daily Bread  

**Mailing Address** *(PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)*  
520 Falls Street, Nelson BC V1L 6B5  

**Email**  
office@kcfoffice.com  

**Contact**  
Anne-Marie Haynes  

**Date of Application**  
02-Dec-2019  

**Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from**  
E  

**Electoral Area**  
Nelson  

**Municipality**  
Ramona Faust  

**Name of Director**  

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**  
$1,000.00

---

### Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.  
We provide a hot nutritious meal to those who are homeless, poor, challenged, disenfranchised, or whoever needs support. Many other support services are also provided.  

Funding will be used for:-  
The grant will be used for the purchase of food, cleaning supplies, and staffing costs.

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

---

**Signature of Applicant**  

**Signature of Sponsor Organization** *(if required)*

---

**Signature of Area Director**  
Approved by Email

**AMOUNT APPROVED**  
$1,000

**Previous Grants Received:**  

| 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |

**Cheque to be forwarded to:**  

| Director | Applicant | Sponsor Organization |

| Board Date | Resolution # |

---

RDCK-1860 Jun 2017

---

395
**Discretionary Grant Application Form**

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

---

**File No. 1860-20-___**

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</th>
<th><strong>Date of Application</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Kootenay Lake</td>
<td>02-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
<th><strong>Phone No.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#206 507 Baker Street, Nelson BC, V1N 4J2</td>
<td>250-777-2744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Email</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:info@friendsofkootenaylake.ca">info@friendsofkootenaylake.ca</a></td>
<td>Camille LeBlanc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please note:** The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

**Funding Payable to:**  
☑ Applicant  ☐ Sponsor Organization

**Name of Sponsor Organization**

**Address of Sponsor Organization** (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**  
$1,000.00

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or 'for profit' entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

---

**Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used**

Our mission is to improve the health and stewardship of Kootenay Lake through monitoring, habitat restoration, capacity building, and the empowerment of communities.

Funding will be used for -

To cover costs of planning and implementing the 2020 Polar Swim at Lakeside Park on New Years Day. This is a fun opportunity for people to come together and show their support for organizations that connect people to their environment and each other.

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

---

**Signature of Applicant**  
Camille LeBlanc

**Signature of Sponsor Organization** (if required)

---

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signature of Area Director</strong></th>
<th><strong>AMOUNT APPROVED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed by Email</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Grants Received:**  
☐ 2014  ☐ 2015  ☐ 2016

**Cheque to be forwarded to:**

☐ Director  ☐ Applicant  ☐ Sponsor Organization

**Board Date**  
Resolution #
Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1860-20--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Special Olympics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/o 1715 Stanley Street, Nelson, B.C. V1L1R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:walgreen@telus.net">walgreen@telus.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-352-7110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong> Karen Walgreen, Local Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>12-Dec-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Request for Discretionary Grant Funding from 
Electoral Area F
Municipality Central Kootenay
Name of Director Tom Newell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT REQUESTED</th>
<th>$250.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Guidelines: The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

**Funding Payable to** 
__Applicant__ Sponsor Organization

**Name of Sponsor Organization** 
Nelson Special Olympics

**Address of Sponsor Organization** (PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)
c/o 1715 Stanley Street, Nelson, B.C. V1L1R6

**Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community

Nelson Special Olympics is a local non profit organization that runs activity and sports teams to benefit people with mental and or physical disabilities.

**Funding will be used for**

- to purchase team bowling shirts for the bowling team so they can participate in local and provincial zone tournaments.

*Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (Including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (If applicable).*

**Signature of Applicant**

Karen Walgreen

**Signature of Sponsor Organization** (if required)

**Authorization**

**AMOUNT APPROVED**

$250.00

Cheque to be forwarded to:

Board Date
Resolution #
**Discretionary Grant Application Form**

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665   Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

**File No. 1860-20-___**

**Applicant Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDCK - AREA E APC - Rescind $5,000 BCUC back to Discretionary</td>
<td>12-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
<td>Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Payable to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sponsor Organization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization</th>
<th>(PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMOUNT REQUESTED**  $ 5,000.00

**Guidelines:** The primary purpose of these grants is to provide some financial assistance to local community groups and organizations for projects that provide social, economic, sporting, cultural and other benefits to our communities.

Grants will not be provided to individuals or ‘for profit’ entities. Grants over $5,000 are subject to a 10% holdback.

**Organization Overview and Description of How Discretionary Funds will be Used**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

**Funding will be used for**

- Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

**Signature of Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>Signed by Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Grants Received:</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__2014 __2015 __2016</td>
<td>$ 5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheque to be forwarded to:</th>
<th>Board Date Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization</th>
<th>(PO Box, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RDCK - AREA E APC - Rescind $5,000 BCUC back to Discretionary**

**Director Newell**

**12-Dec-2019**

**$ 5,000.00**

**Signed by Email**

**$ 5,000.00**

**Signed by Email**
**Community Development Grant Application**

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

**File No. 1865-20-**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date of Application</strong></th>
<th><strong>AMOUNT REQUESTED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tilted Brick Gallery Association</td>
<td>January 5 2020</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mailing Address (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3426 Goat Mountain Forest Service Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston BC V0A 1G8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Email</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone No.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nannie Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Request for Community Development Funding from**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Electoral Area</strong></th>
<th><strong>Municipality</strong></th>
<th><strong>Name of Director</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding Payable to</strong></th>
<th>** Applicant _ Sponsor Organization**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name of Sponsor Organization**

**Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

**Newly Formed Non-Profit, Artist Run Community Art Space**

Funding will be used for:

To purchase AV equipment for educational art lessons and community art learning nights.

Which funding criteria objectives does this project meet? Social _ Economic _ Environmental

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

**Signature of Applicant**

**Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)**

**Signature of Area Director**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AMOUNT APPROVED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received:

2014 _ 2015 _ 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:

Director _ Applicant _ Sponsor Organization

Board Date: Resolution #
Community Development Grant Application

Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>Jan. 8/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</td>
<td>Request for Community Development Funding from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Electoral Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Name of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT REQUESTED</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Payable to</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Sponsor Organization</td>
<td>The Community Development Program supports initiatives which further the social, economic and environmental well being of the Regional District's residents and organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used |
| Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community. |

| Funding will be used for | Subsidizing mosquito service |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which funding criterial objectives does this project meet?</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Applicant</th>
<th>Signature of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Area Director</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Grants Received
2014 __ 2015 __ 2016

Cheque to be forwarded to: __Director __Applicant __Sponsor Organization

Board Date:
Resolution #
**Contact Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>Castlegar Snowmobile Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>December 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Contact:</td>
<td>Al Cecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>c/o Area I Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Number:</td>
<td>250-365-7087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muaymantis@gmail.com">muaymantis@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>250-304-8233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Application Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDCK Area Director:</td>
<td>Andy Davidoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About Your Organization:**

Overview of Organizations Programs and Services offered in the community:
The Castlegar Snowmobile Association provides and maintains diverse snowmobiling trails and amenities throughout the Castlegar & District region.

If available, please attach all or any of the following documents:
- Most recent Audited Financial Statement and current financial statement
- List of Directors, Structure of Organization including full time staff, part time staff, community volunteers
- Current Year Budget
- Number of Members and Membership Fee (if applicable)

**Grant Application:**

Total Grant Requested: $2500

What will this Grant be used for?
To assist the Castlegar Snowmobile Association to complete its maintenance/storage facility.

Which funding criteria objective does the project meet? (Social and/or Economic and/or Environmental)
Social

**Signing Authority:**

Signature - Applicant Area Director

Signed by Email

**For Office Use:**

Total Grant Approved: $2,500.00

Previous Grants Received:
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008

Board Approval Date:

Board Resolution:
**Community Development Grant Application**

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Kootenay Eco-Society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-507 Baker Street Nelson BC V1L4J9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:montana@ecosociety.ca">montana@ecosociety.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-352-1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Burgess Exec. Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Payable to** ✓ Applicant  __ Sponsor Organization

**Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

Protecting Wild Spaces and Building Sustainable Communities

Funding will be used for -

Area E Watershed Policy Coordinator

Which funding criterial objectives does this project meet? ✓ Social  __ Economic  ✓ Environmental

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

**Signature of Applicant**  
**Signature of Sponsor Organization** (if required)

**Authorization**

**Signature of Area Director** Signed by Email  
**AMOUNT APPROVED**  
$ 2,500.00

Previous Grants Received  
___2014  ___2015  ___2016

Cheque to be forwarded to:  
__Director  ✓ Applicant  __Sponsor Organization

Board Date:  
Resolution #

Montana Burgess Exec. Director  
206-507 Baker Street Nelson BC V1L4J9  
montana@ecosociety.ca  
250-352-1909

West Kootenay Eco-Society  
206-507 Baker Street Nelson BC V1L4J9  
montana@ecosociety.ca  
250-352-1909
Community Development Grant Application

Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>2019-12-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlegar District Hospital Foundation</td>
<td>Request for Community Development Funding from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</td>
<td>Electoral Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705-10 St, Castlegar, VIN 2HZ</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-304-1209</td>
<td>Name of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefanie Zaufack - Office Mgr.</td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Payable to _ Applicant _ Sponsor Organization

| Name of Sponsor Organization | A/A |
| Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code) | A/A |

The Community Development Program supports initiatives which further the social, economic and environmental well being of the Regional District’s residents and organizations.

Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community:

The Castlegar District Hospital Foundation provides support for Talarico Place and the Castlegar Health Centre.

Funding will be used for:

- To provide additional funds to the Castlegar District Hospital Foundation to support health services and facilities in the Castlegar District community.

Which funding criteria objectives does this project meet? Social _ Economic _ Environmental

Please attach the most recent updated financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

Signature of Applicant | Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Zaufack (Lee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 2015 2016</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cheque to be forwarded to: Director _ Applicant _ Sponsor Organization

Board Date: Resolution #

ROCK-1865 Jun 2017
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## Community Development Grant Application

### Regional District of Central Kootenay
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665 Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20___

### Applicant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Applicant</strong></th>
<th>Kootenay Gallery of Art, History and Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Application</strong></td>
<td>12-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address</strong></th>
<th>P Box, ni, ree, Cl, Prov, Posal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>250-365-3337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Email** | kootenaygallery@telus.net |
| **Contact** | Val Field |

**Please note:** The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization assistance.

### Funding Payable to  ✔ Applicant  Sponsor Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding Payable to</strong></th>
<th>✔ Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Organization</strong></th>
<th>Kootenay Gallery of Art, History and Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used

The Kootenay Gallery is a non profit public art gallery presenting programming and exhibitions of regional and provincial artists.

The Kootenay Gallery's major annual fundraisers, Soup for the Cultured Soul, to be held on February 22, 2020. Funds will be used to compensate the artists for the cost of materials to produce the pottery bowls used at the event. This is a fundraiser that truly supports local artists and businesses.

### Which funding criteria objectives does this project meet? ✔ Social ✔ Economic

Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signature of Applicant</strong></th>
<th>Valentine Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Signature of Sponsor Organization** | |

### Authorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Previous Grants Received</strong></th>
<th><strong>2014</strong> 5 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheque or Order to</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsor Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMOUNT APPROVED</strong></td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Date:**

**Resolution #**

---

**Kootenay Gallery of Art, History and Science**

120 Heritage Way, Castlegar, BC V1N 4M5

kootenaygallery@telus.net

250-365-3337

Val Field

Area J

Rick Smith

The Community Development Program supports initiatives which further the social, economic and environmental well being of the Regional District's residents and organizations.
## Community Development Grant Application

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**  
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

---

**Applicant Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Volunteer Fire Dept.</td>
<td>04-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Request for Community Development Funding from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Monashee Ave. Edgewood BC V0G 1J0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250-269-7525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Electoral Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Dummett</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Name of Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Peterson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMOUNT REQUESTED | $ 500.00 |

---

**Funding Payable to**

- **Applicant**
- **Sponsor Organization**

**Name of Sponsor Organization**

**Address of Sponsor Organization** (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov. Postal Code)

---

**Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

Funding will be used for:
- costs to burn the community burn pile.

**Which funding criterion objectives does this project meet?**

- **Social**
- **Economic**
- **Environmental**

Please attach the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

---

**Signature of Applicant**

**Signature of Sponsor Organization** (if required)

---

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Grants Received**

- 2014
- 2015
- 2016

**Cheque to be forwarded to:**

- Director
- Applicant
- Sponsor Organization

**Board Date:**

**Resolution #**

---
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# Community Development Grant Application

**Regional District of Central Kootenay**

202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson BC V1L 5R4  
Phone 250-352-6665  Fax 250-352-9300  
Toll Free in BC 1-800-268-7325

File No. 1865-20-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Information</th>
<th>Date of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Applicant</strong> (Organization or Society)</td>
<td>13-Dec-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauquier Community Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing Address</strong> (PO Box, Unit #, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</td>
<td>Request for Community Development Funding from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 70 Fauquier BC V0G 1K0</td>
<td>Electoral Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone No.</strong></td>
<td>AMOUNT REQUESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-269-0028</td>
<td>$1,207.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Fraser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please note: The Applicant must be able to deposit the funding payment in their name or have a sponsor organization assistance.

- Funding Payable to: **Applicant** _Sponsor Organization_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sponsor Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address of Sponsor Organization (PO Box, Unit, Street, City, Prov., Postal Code)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- The Community Development Program supports initiatives which further the social, economic and environmental well being of the Regional District's residents and organizations.

### Organization Overview and Description of How Community Development Funds will be Used

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community.

- look after the community hall and the communities best interest

- Funding will be used for:  
  cost of moving and burning the community burn pile.

- Which funding criteria objectives does this project meet?  
  ✓ Social  ✓ Economic  ✓ Environmental

- Please attach: the most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement, list of Directors, organizational chart (including full and part-time staff and community volunteers, number of members and membership fees (if applicable).

- **Signature of Applicant**  
  Submitted by Email

### Signature of Sponsor Organization (if required)

**Authorization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Area Director</th>
<th>AMOUNT APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Peterson</td>
<td>$1,207.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Previous Grants Received  
  2014  2015  2016

- Cheque to be forwarded to:  
  ___ Director  ___ Applicant  ___ Sponsor Organization

- Board Date:  
  Resolution #
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANT**

**Application Form**

**REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY**
202 Lakeside Drive, Box 590, Nelson, B.C. V1L 5R4
Phone 250-352-6665   Fax 250-352-9300
Toll Free in B.C. 1-800-268-7325

FILE NO. 1865-20--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date: September 30, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Society Name:</td>
<td>Village of Slocan - Waterfront Detailed Design Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheque PAYABLE* to:</td>
<td>RDCK Electoral Area/Member Municipality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*Recipient receiving funding must be able to deposit payment to their bank account):</td>
<td>• Area -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Municipality -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLOCAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Contact:</td>
<td>Michelle Gordon, CAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Address:</td>
<td>To be completed by RDCK Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 50, 503 Slocan Street, Slocan BC, V0G 2C0</td>
<td>Cheque to be forwarded to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Phone #:</td>
<td>(check one and ensure address is indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-355-2277</td>
<td>• Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contact Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Fax #:</td>
<td>Organization Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About Your Organization**

Please provide an overview of organizational programs and services offered in the community:

**Municipal Contribution Amount - Waterfront Development Phase 1 - DETAILED DESIGN PLAN**

Please attach the following documents (if available):

- Most recent audited financial statement and current financial statement
- List of Directors, structure of organization including full and part-time staff and community volunteers
- Current year's budget
- Number of members and membership fee (if applicable)

**Grant Application:**

Total Grant Requested: $4,830.00

**What will this grant be used for?**

**Municipal Contribution Amount - Waterfront Development Phase 1 - DETAILED DESIGN PLAN**

Which funding criteria/objectives does this project meet? **✓ Social**  **✓ Economic**  **✓ Environmental**

**Signature of Area Director**

Total Grant Approved $  

Previous Grants Received: 2013 2014 2015  

Board Approval Date:  

Resolution #
December 17, 2019

Clayton Creek Improvement District
C/O Breanne Gaudreau
4166 Granger Road
Nelson BC
V1L 6T1
Sent via email: dan_breanne@hotmail.com

Dear Breanne,

I have reviewed the Clayton Creek Improvement District Community Works Fund file and the approval granted on November 20, 2014 (Res 667/14). Since there has been no movement on this project in over 6 years, I am rescinding the $46,000 in Community Works Funds awarded to the Clayton Creek Improvement District for the Water System Upgrade project.

This action by no means prevents future applications from your water system. If you wish to discuss future co-funding for improvements to your water system, please contact me at:

tnewell@rdck.bc.ca

250.509.1277

Tom Newell
Electoral Area Director – Area F

Cc Tanji Zumpano – RDCK Community Works Grant Co-ordinator