



## PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 21, 2013  
SCRD Board Room, 1975 Field Road, Sechelt, BC

### AMENDED AGENDA

**CALL TO ORDER** 9:30 a.m.

#### AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda

#### INVITATION

2. Colleen Clarke, Sechelt & District Chamber of Commerce  
Re: Funding Request for 2013  
**(Economic Development)**  
ANNEX A  
pp 1 – 9  
**⇒ADD**  
pp 6(a-d)  
**REPLACE**  
pp 8 - 9

#### DELEGATION

3. Bob Morris  
Re: Ocean Beach Esplanade Road Closure  
**Electoral Area E (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX B  
pp 10 – 34

#### REPORTS

- 3(a) Healthy Forests – Healthy Communities: A Conversation on BC Forests  
**(Regional Planning Services)**  
ANNEX C  
pp 35 – 42
4. Exemption from Ministerial Approval of SCRDR Planning Bylaws  
**Electoral Areas A to F (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX D  
pp 43 – 51
5. Narrows Inlet Hydro Project Environmental Assessment Update  
**Electoral Area A (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX E  
pp 52 – 72
- 5.(a) **⇒ADD** Narrows Inlet Hydro Project Environmental Assessment: Draft Workplan  
**⇒ADD**  
ANNEX EE  
pp 72 (a-p)
6. Exploring Zoning Options for Medical Marijuana  
**(Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX F  
pp 73 – 77
7. Referral for Proposed Bylaw No. 120 2013 Associated Islands, Islets and Waters Areas in the Gambier Trust Area, Island Trust  
**Electoral Areas B-F (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX G  
pp 78 – 81
8. Development Variance Permit Application No. 310.171 (Gray)  
**Electoral Area B (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX H  
pp 82 – 93
9. Development Variance Permit Application No. 310.169 (Mittlestead)  
**Electoral Area D (Rural Planning Services)**  
ANNEX I  
pp 94 – 107

- |     |  |                         |
|-----|--|-------------------------|
| 10. | Dog Control Conflict Avoidance Proposal – Yellow Dog Project<br><b>(Animal Control)</b>                              | ANNEX J<br>pp 108 – 111 |
| 11. | Building Department Revenues for February, 2013<br><b>(Building Inspection)</b>                                      | ANNEX K<br>pp 112 – 116 |
| 12. | Planning and Development Monthly Report for February, 2013<br><b>(Regional/Rural Planning Services)</b>              | ANNEX L<br>pp 117 – 124 |
| 13. | Hillside Development Group Minutes of February 18, 2013<br><b>(Hillside)</b>   | ANNEX M<br>pp 125 – 128 |
| 14. | Heritage Protocol Advisory Committee Minutes of March 1, 2013<br><b>(Regional Planning Services)</b>                 | ANNEX N<br>pp 129 – 132 |
| 15. | Howe Sound Community Forum Notes of February 26, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area F (Rural Planning Services)</b>           | ANNEX O<br>pp 133 – 140 |
| 16. | Agricultural Advisory Committee Minutes of February 26, 2013<br><b>(Regional Planning Services)</b>                  | ANNEX P<br>pp 141 – 144 |
| 17. | Egmont/Pender Harbour (Area A) APC Minutes of February 27, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area A (Rural Planning Services)</b> | ANNEX Q<br>pp 145 – 147 |
| 18. | Halfmoon Bay (Area B) APC Minutes of February 26, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area B (Rural Planning Services)</b>          | ANNEX R<br>pp 148 – 150 |
| 19. | Roberts Creek (Area D) APC Minutes of February 25, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area D (Rural Planning Services)</b>         | ANNEX S<br>pp 151 – 152 |
| 20. | Elphinstone (Area E) APC Minutes of February 27, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area E (Rural Planning Services)</b>           | ANNEX T<br>pp 153 – 156 |
| 21. | West Howe Sound (Area F) APC Minutes of February 26, 2013<br><b>Electoral Area F (Rural Planning Services)</b>       | ANNEX U<br>pp 157 – 160 |

#### COMMUNICATIONS

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 22. | <u>Islands Trust</u><br>Re: Greening Our Shores – Shoreline Stewardship Event                          | ANNEX V<br>pp 161                        |
| 23. | <u>Western Economic Diversification</u><br>Re: Western Canada's Shipbuilding Symposium                 | ANNEX W<br>pp 162 – 167                  |
| 24. | ⇒ <b>ADD</b> <u>Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training</u><br>Re: Economic Development Workshop | ANNEX WW<br>⇒ <b>ADD</b><br>pp 168 - 169 |

#### IN CAMERA

The public be excluded from attendance at the meeting in accordance with the *Community Charter*, Section 90 (1) “(a) personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality; (i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;” are to be discussed.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**SECHELT AND DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

**FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**(Unaudited – See Notice to Reader)**

**DECEMBER 31, 2012**

**INDEX**

**Notice to Reader**

**Statement 1            Statement of Operations and Net Assets**

**Statement 2            Financial Position**

**Notes to the financial statements**

## SECHELT &amp; DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

## STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012

(Unaudited - See Notice to Reader)

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>REVENUE</b>		
Membership Dues	\$ 21,069	\$ 18,455
Group Insurance Revenue	20,368	20,546
District of Sechelt Grant	-	10,000
Event Revenue	11,042	7,754
Other Revenue	97	2,524
	<u>52,576</u>	<u>59,279</u>
<b>EXPENSES (note 3)</b>		
Salaries and benefits	32,474	28,475
Bad Debts	-	4,843
Insurance	1,748	511
Event Expenses	6,287	4,919
Rent	4,547	4,607
Amortization	219	313
Telephone and internet	1,792	2,185
Advertising and website	143	535
Postage	199	239
Dues and fees	1,743	1,634
Conference	-	-
Office and computer	1,093	545
Accounting	700	600
Bank charges and interest	1,581	1,534
	<u>52,526</u>	<u>50,940</u>
<b>Excess of revenue over expenses</b>	<u>\$ 50</u>	<u>\$ 8,339</u>
Net assets, Opening	( <u>\$3,619</u> )	( <u>\$11,958</u> )
Net Assets, Closing	( <u>\$3,569</u> )	( <u>\$3,619</u> )

*Peter Telfer*  
*Certified General Accountant*

## SECHLT &amp; DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

## FINANCIAL POSITION

AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2012

(Unaudited - See Notice to Reader)

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b><u>ASSETS</u></b>		
<b>CURRENT ASSETS</b>		
Accounts Receivable	\$ 9,111	\$ 9,395
	<u>9,111</u>	<u>9,395</u>
Property, Plant & Equipment (Note 2)	<u>511</u>	<u>730</u>
	<u>\$ 9,622</u>	<u>\$ 10,125</u>
<b><u>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</u></b>		
<b>CURRENT LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$ 1,869	\$ 3,787
Bank Indebtedness	11,322	9,957
	<u>13,191</u>	<u>13,744</u>
<b><u>NET ASSETS</u></b>		
Net assets invested in:		
Property, Plant & Equipment	511	730
Unrestricted	-	-
	<u>4,080</u>	<u>4,349</u>
	<u>3,569</u>	<u>3,619</u>
	<u>\$ 9,622</u>	<u>\$ 10,125</u>

APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_

Director

*Peter Telfer*  
*Certified General Accountant*

**SECHELT & DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
DECEMBER 31, 2012**

**Unaudited - See Notice to Reader**

The organization's objective is to promote and improve trade, commerce and the economic, civic and social welfare of Sechelt and the surrounding district.

**Note 1 Accounting Policies**

Amortization

Amortization of equipment is recorded using the straight-line method over 3 years for office equipment and computers and 5 years for furniture and fixtures.

Contributed Services

The organization receives assistance from volunteers, but because of the difficulty of determining the fair value of this assistance, contributed services are not recognized in the financial statements.

**Note 2 Property, Plant & Equipment**

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Accumulated Amortization</u>	<u>Net Book Value</u>	
			<u>2012</u>	<u>2011</u>
Office equipment	\$ 8,626	\$ 8,626	\$ -	\$ -
Photocopier	6,140	6,140	-	-
Computer	3,576	3,065	511	730
	<u>\$ 18,342</u>	<u>\$ 17,831</u>	<u>\$ 511</u>	<u>\$ 730</u>

*Peter Telfer  
Certified General Accountant*

## 2013 Economic Development

### Function 531-535

\*\*note that there are two "custom views" set up. One for when you want to print Columns /

#### Area A Egmont Pender Harbour

**Total Line Item 01-2-531-214** **\$ 27,398.00 Budget**

2013 Discretionary Grant Funds (to be distributed) \$ 5,000.20

Committed: Economic Development \$ -

**SUBTOTAL uncommitted discretionary funds as at February 2013** **\$ 5,000.20**

Grants Committed:

Pender Harbour Chamber - VIC (Ambassador and Washrooms) \$ 12,972.00

Pender Harbour Chamber - Tourism Sanitation Services \$ 1,612.80

Sunshine Coast Tourism \$ 5,183.00

Pender Harbour Chamber - Overages (Sanitation) \$ 2,330.00

Gibsons Chamber - Travel Ambassador Program \$ 300.00

**\$ -**

---

#### Area B Halfmoon Bay

**Total Line Item 01-2-532-214** **\$ 13,815.00 Budget**

2013 Discretionary Grant Funds (to be distributed) \$ 9,700.00

Committed: Economic Development \$ -

**SUBTOTAL uncommitted discretionary funds as at February 2013** **\$ 9,700.00**

Grants Committed:

Sunshine Coast Tourism \$ 3,815.00

Gibsons Chamber - Travel Ambassador Program \$ 300.00

**\$ -**

---



**Surplus/Deficit  
Economic Development 2013**

Updated 22/03/2013

**Area D Roberts Creek**

**Total Line Item 01-2-533-214** **\$ 10,000.00 Budget**

2013 Discretionary Grant Funds (to be distributed) \$ 6,653.00

Committed: Economic Development \$ -

**SUBTOTAL uncommitted discretionary funds as at February 2013** **\$ 6,653.00**

Grants Committed:

Sunshine Coast Tourism \$ 3,047.00

Gibsons Chamber - Travel Ambassador Program \$ 300.00

**\$ -**

**Area E Elphinstone**

**Total Line Item 01-2-534-214** **\$ 10,378.00 Budget**

2013 Discretionary Grant Funds (to be distributed) \$ -

Committed: Economic Development \$ -

**SUBTOTAL uncommitted discretionary funds as at February 2013** **\$ -**

Grants Committed:

Gibsons Chamber - VIC \$ 1,625.00

Sunshine Coast Tourism \$ 2,203.00

Gibsons Chamber - Travel Ambassador Program \$ 300.00

Coast Initiatives \$ 6,250.00

**\$ -**

**Area F West Howe Sound**

**Total Line Item 01-2-535-214** **\$ 29,677.00 Budget**

2013 Discretionary Grant Funds (to be distributed) \$ -

Committed: Economic Development \$ -

**SUBTOTAL uncommitted discretionary funds as at February 2013** **\$ -**

Grants Committed:

Gibsons Chamber - VIC \$ 4,875.00

Sunshine Coast Tourism \$ 5,752.00

Gibsons Chamber - Travel Ambassador Program \$ 300.00

Coast Initiatives \$ 18,750.00

**\$ -**

**SCRD STAFF REPORT**

---

**DATE:** March 11, 2013**TO:** Planning and Development Committee (March 21, 2013)**FROM:** David Rafael, Senior Planner**RE:** **NARROWS INLET HYDRO PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: DRAFT WORKPLAN**

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. THAT the report titled “Narrows Inlet Hydro Project Environmental Assessment: Draft Workplan” be received;**
- 2. AND THAT the comments contained in Attachment A be forwarded to the Environmental Assessment Office (EAO);**
- 3. AND THAT the EAO be requested to hold a new public consultation period to allow for full public review of the reports and studies that are required by the EAO from Narrows Inlet Hydro Holding Corp.**

---

**BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

A separate report on the March 21, 2013 Planning and Development Committee agenda provides background regarding the current status of the environmental assessment for the Narrows Inlet Hydro Project.

After that report was completed, additional information was provided by the Environmental Assessment Officer (EAO) regarding the draft workplan required from the proponent.

The EAO requested comments to be provided by March 25, 2013. The next step will be for the EAO to consider comments provided by the SCRd, Shishalh Nation and provincial/federal staff and make adjustments to the workplan. The proponent will then be required to complete the workplan. The EAO may also require that a second public consultation period is opened to allow for feedback on the new/revised reports and studies required from the proponent.

At this time it is not known what the timeline will be for the EAO to issue the workplan or for the proponent to implement it.

Staff attached the draft workplan containing draft comments to be sent to the EAO (Attachment A).

One key aspect of the workplan is that it clarifies that two components of the project CC and SS Creeks will be removed from consideration. These may be revisited at a later date.

Ramona Creek components are still included and the draft comments note the concerns raised by some of the property owners (which are included in the other report). Staff are asking that the EAO make it a requirement that the proposed studies take into account concerns regarding stream bank stability and potable water supplies for those properties. Also, staff suggest that the property owners are asked to assist in carrying out the required studies by allowing reasonable access.

---

David Rafael, Senior Planner

**Narrows Inlet Hydro Project**

666 Gibsons Way, Box 1611  
Gibsons, BC, Canada V0N 1V0  
Tel 604.886.7900 Fax 604.886.8964  
Email NI@NIHydro.ca  
www.NIHvdro.ca

## Narrows Inlet Hydroelectric Project

### Workplan

7 March 2013

This document summarizes the actions the Proponent proposes to undertake to address the information deficiencies and show stoppers identified by the EAO in the letter 30050-20/NIHY-05-06 dated 25 January 2013.

The Proponent agrees to several amendments to the Project Application as follows:

1. The Proponent fully removes the CC and SS Components from the environmental assessment. This will reduce the project footprint, eliminate effects related to two of the three lake storage components and reduce effects on wildlife, fish and fish habitat in the Tzoonie Valley and in Tzoonie River. The proponent will submit a formal request to the EAO to remove these two components which will include details of how this will change the Project effects.
2. Additional field data is being collected to address the key information deficiencies which have been identified and to submit reports to the authorities detailing the extent to which the additional data addresses the information deficiencies and how this effects project uncertainty.
3. The level of drawdown for Ramona Lake is reduced from 45 meters to a maximum of 9 meters in the first year.
4. The surcharge of Ramona Lake has been eliminated. If studies on soil mercury content indicate lack of potential for methyl-mercury formation, the surcharge will be reinstated.
5. The proponent commits to address a few outstanding items before start of construction.

The tables below summarize the specific actions proposed by the Proponent to address the deficiencies. We understand that the regulator will provide us with certainty that this workplan meets the Ministry's requirements and when implemented, fully address the issues that have been raised.

The commitments proposed for certification are highlighted in blue text.

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Wildlife Information Deficiency 1</b></p> <p><b>Lack of adequate baseline data for Tailed Frogs.</b>                      Consequently, it is not possible to determine whether mitigation and/or compensation proposed to offset indirect Project effects (water level changes and fluctuations) is sufficient to reduce residual effect to non-significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced. Only SS Lake has been determined to be Tailed Frog bearing.</li> <li>• It is understood that this issue pertains only to the diversion reaches of Chickwat Creek and Lower/Upper Ramona Creek.</li> <li>• Existing studies have determined that the diversion on Chickwat Creek will result in a net improvement to Tailed Frog habitat.</li> <li>• <u>Prior to construction, The Proponent commits to commissioning further studies to design a monitoring and mitigation plan.</u></li> <li>• <u>The monitoring and mitigation plan will be implemented during the construction and operational phases of the project.</u></li> <li>• <u>The extent of potential residual effects related to the diversions will be mitigated by releasing an acceptable minimum instream flow (i.e., coarse threshold values, as defined in Hatfield et al 2004) in the lower diversion reach of Ramona Creek and the lower reach of Chickwat Creek, below the falls.</u></li> <li>• <u>The Proponent also commits to developing a CTF monitoring program aimed at assessing potential project effects in both Ramona and Chickwat Creeks. The program will focus on areas considered to constitute high quality habitat in the diversion reaches. The plan for this program will be available for FLNRO to review prior to certification and will be implemented prior to construction.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>Providing SS Lake is the only location that is Tailed Frog bearing then the suggested work is satisfactory. SCR D requests that the province confirm the conclusions regarding habitat improvement for Tailed Frog.</b></p> <p><b>If additional studies are to be commissioned prior to construction, why would they not be required before the project is authorized? If it is acceptable for pre-construction studies as the means for mitigating the issue then how far in advance will these take place and will there be sufficient time to amend construction plans if the studies show a need to do so?</b></p> <p><b>Post construction monitoring is supported as a means to further understand the long term impacts of hydro projects especially when clustered in an area.</b></p> <p><b>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis form the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should make it clear what steps need to be taken if the monitoring shows a detrimental impact and which agency is responsible for ensuring corrective action takes place.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Wildlife Information Deficiency 2</b></p> <p><b>Mitigation measures proposed for direct Project effects on Tailed Frogs and Tailed Frog habitat is expensive and onerous.</b> There is concern over whether construction can reasonably occur based on restrictions.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• It is understood that this issue pertains only to the diversion reaches of Chickwat Creek and Lower/Upper Ramona Creek.</li> <li>• <u>The Proponent commits to conducting pre-construction surveys, and salvage operations will be executed prior to breaking ground.</u></li> <li>• Proponent considers the cost of this commitment to be acceptable.</li> <li>• <u>Prior to construction, The Proponent commits to commissioning further studies to design a monitoring and mitigation plan.</u></li> <li>• <u>The monitoring and mitigation plan will be implemented during the construction and operational phases of the project.</u></li> <li>• <u>The extent of potential residual effects related to the diversions will be mitigated by releasing an acceptable minimum instream flow (i.e., coarse threshold values, as defined in Hatfield et al 2004) in the lower diversion reach of Ramona Creek and the lower reach of Chickwat Creek, below the falls.</u></li> <li>• <u>The Proponent also commits to developing a CTF monitoring program aimed at assessing potential project effects in both Ramona and Chickwat Creeks. The program will focus on areas considered to constitute high quality habitat in the diversion reaches. The plan for this program will be available for FLNRO to review prior to certification and will be implemented prior to construction.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>The estimated costs for conducting the mitigation measures may be in the vast documentation provided for the NIHP and if so it should be brought forward in the response to the concern. Does the province have an estimated cost for the mitigation work? If there are no such estimates then what is the basis for the concern?</b></p> <p><b>While it is unlikely at this stage to develop an estimated cost down to the nickel, it should be possible to agree broad costs before the project is authorized.</b></p> <p><b>Support is given to monitoring as this will be crucial in determining if the mitigation measures are effective. The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis form the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should make it clear what steps need to be taken if the mitigation measures are unsuccessful and identify the agency responsible for taking the appropriate action.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Wildlife Information Deficiency 3</b></p> <p><b>No mitigation or compensation commitment from Proponent to offset Project-related habitat loss for Northern Goshawk as specifically requested by FLNRO.</b> The mitigation for nesting birds is adequate but general habitat loss from Project footprint is not addressed, and therefore a significant residual effect on this species cannot be ruled out.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• The project impact area is not a sensitive site for the Northern Goshawk, and does not appear on the sensitive site areas list for Northern Goshawk.</li> <li>• It is understood that the potential habitat area is limited to 1.5 hectares in the entire project impact area.</li> <li>• It is unclear what part of the 1.5 hectares area is of Goshawk high quality habitat, and possibly this will be a small part of the habitat.</li> <li>• <u>The proponent commits to conduct a pre-construction evaluation of the 1.5 hectares area, confirm the residual impacts, and propose a compensation program for approval.</u></li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to a compensation program that meets the provincial guidelines, including forestry guidelines for the Northern Goshawk. The Proponent commits to conducting a pre-construction evaluation of the remaining high quality habitat (as identified in the Application) and compensate for the actual high-quality habitat loss, in accordance with FLNRO approved compensation guidelines or methods. It is understood that this compensation may be used to fund Northern Goshawk inventory studies in the region.</u></li> <li>• <u>At the preference of MFLNRO, the cost of compensation can instead be contributed to the Ministry for its program to study, inventory and research of Northern Goshawk.</u></li> <li>• A ministry guideline for the logging industry operating in this area is attached.</li> <li>• A Resource Risk report will be submitted to quantify the risk to sensitive habitat.</li> </ul>	<p>SCRD requests that the province confirm the conclusion regarding habitat location for Northern Goshawk.</p> <p><b>If additional studies are to be commissioned prior to construction, why would they not be required before the project is authorized? If it is acceptable for pre-construction studies as the means for mitigating the issue then how far in advance will these take place and will there be sufficient time to amend construction plans if the studies show a need to do so?</b></p> <p><b>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis form the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should make it clear what steps need to be taken if the studies show potential impact and identify the agency responsible for taking the appropriate action.</b></p> <p><b>With regard to where the compensation, the efforts and benefits need to be firstly within the project area. If this is not possible or there are substantial benefits for compensation being elsewhere then it needs to be within the SCRD area. If the impacts are within the SCRD area then it is not acceptable that the compensation takes place in another location a distance away.</b></p> <p><b>If MFLNRO determines that there is no need for physical compensation and it is best as a contribution to a research fund, then it should be clear how the fund is to be spent and how it will directly benefit the Northern Goshawk population within the SCRD area.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Wildlife Show Stopper 1</b></p> <p><b>Information provided and proposed mitigation for Project-related loss of Grizzly Bear habitat is not sufficient to assess specific impacts and reduce effects to below significant.</b> Additionally, it is unclear whether compensation (funds for research) offered will benefit locally affected area and whether there is any mechanism to address Project-driven effects identified in the research.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the population is utilizing the Ramona Creek watershed, and tracking data demonstrates that a tracked female forage activity is limited well away from Ramona Creek.</li> <li>• This area is not a sensitive habitat site for Grizzly Bears and no other industrial users with significant impacts, such as forestry, logging, recreation, and hunting activities, need to do any special work when operating in this area.</li> <li>• The Tzoonie area including the Project assessment areas have not been identified in a recent comprehensive and long-term study of Grizzly Bear habitat, distribution and periodicity in the Sunshine Coast as an area of interest or concern. The study was conducted by Greg George, Sr. Ecosystems Biologist of MFLNRO, and identified a large number of areas on the Sunshine Coast as Grizzly Bear Wildlife Habitat Area. However there were no designation of any areas and polygons in the Tzoonie/ Narrows Inlet watershed as a Wildlife Habitat Management of interest or concern.</li> <li>• <u>Proponent will submit an acceptable Human-Bear Interaction Management Plan prior to start of construction.</u></li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to a presence-absence study for the Ramona watershed and the monitoring of bear activity in the Tzoonie area.</u></li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to a study by Clayton Apps to inform of adaptive management of Grizzlies habitat and the actual effects of the project on migration patterns, and methods of mitigation.</u></li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to contribute to the Ministry for its programs to track, study, inventory and research Grizzly bears and habitat.</u></li> <li>• <u>The Proponent commits to developing a Grizzly bear monitoring study in the Chickwat Creek/Tzoonie River area, in consideration of existing grizzly bear collar and other collected data, and in consultation with a qualified professional with specific experience with Grizzly Bears (such as Dr. Clayton Apps). The objectives of this program are to: provide further information of grizzly bear use and movement in the Project area; allow assessment of potential project impacts; and, inform future adaptive management measures. This program outline will be submitted to the EAO prior to certification, and initiated post-certification and prior to construction.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>SCRD requests that the province confirm the conclusion regarding Grizzly Bear distribution.</b></p> <p><b>If additional studies are to be commissioned prior to construction, why would they not be required before the project is authorized? If it is acceptable for pre-construction studies as the means for mitigating the issue then how far in advance will these take place and will there be sufficient time to amend construction plans if the studies show a need to do so?</b></p> <p><b>Support is given to monitoring studies.</b></p> <p><b>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should make it clear what steps need to be taken if the studies show potential impact and identify the agency responsible for taking the appropriate action.</b></p> <p><b>A Human-Bear Interaction Management Plan is an important safety measure and the SCRD supports the development of such a plan before construction commences.</b></p> <p><b>The SCRD supports the commitment to contribute to increasing information/knowledge regarding Grizzly Bears in this area.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Wildlife Show Stopper 2</b></p> <p><b>The effect of the proposed level of drawdown in CC, SS and Ramona Lakes on Small (high – elevation) Lake Ecosystems is not mitigable.</b> No compensation has been proposed by the Proponent to render this residual effect non-significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced as both SS creek and CC creek have alpine lakes similar to Ramona Lake.</li> <li>• Ramona Lake is a non-fish bearing lake and the only small high-elevation lake proposed for drawdown.</li> <li>• Ramona Lake is the highest of the lakes in the Project assessment area and is covered in snow and ice at least 8 months of each year.</li> <li>• <u>The proposed maximum drawdown has been reduced from 45 meters to an incremental drawdown regime that over three years will reach 18 meters.</u></li> <li>• <u>Proponent proposes a first year drawdown of a maximum of 9 meters, 2nd year addition of 5 meters, and 3rd year addition of 4 meters, and 3 meters incremental drawdown per year thereafter. There will be an assessment by a qualified professional each year to sign off on the drawdown for the following year.</u></li> <li>• The estimated maximum extent of riparian habitat loss on Ramona Lake will be modeled and calculated, based on conservative assumptions of habitat value, and presented to the regulator.</li> <li>• <u>The Proponent commits to pre-construction surveys and studies to identify the actual extent and value of riparian habitat in the littoral zone of Ramona Lake, develop a compensation program, and provide compensation in accordance with MFLNRO requirements. Compensation is an approved form of mitigation as per ministry guidelines.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>Some owners of property in the Ramona Creek subdivision are concerned about the impact of changes to the flow regime of Ramona Creek due to damming the lake. Although the property owners directed to the Regional Hydrologist, the SCR D forwarded the concerns to HIHP along with a request that they be addressed. Copy of the relevant letters is attached. Their main concerns are possibility of accelerated bank erosion and increase turbidity.</b></p> <p><b>The phased approach to altering the lake level and monitoring may alleviate some of the concerns. The pre-construction surveys and studies need to be made publically available along with any analysis from provincial staff to allow for the property owners to make any comments/concerns known. This should be done prior to the province authorizing any changes to the drawdown level.</b></p> <p><b>The SCR D asks that the property owners assist NIHP and the province to carry out the studies by allowing reasonable access to their properties to establish baseline and monitor impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Additional information and comments are provided below with respect to IFR (instream flow requirements) and suspended sediment.</b></p>



Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 1</i></b></p> <p><b>Lack of adequate baseline data and/or consideration given to Project-related effects on water quality.</b> Specifically, methyl mercury formation due to proposed flooding at CC and Ramona Lakes, and acid rock drainage/metal leaching.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced as both SS creek and CC creek have alpine lakes similar to Ramona Lake.</li> <li>• It is understood that this Information Deficiency relates solely to lack of baseline data on methyl-mercury formation due to flooding (lake surcharge), and the potentiality of Metal leaching/Acid Rock Drainage.</li> <li>• <u>The development plan has been amended to not surcharge Ramona Lake. If the results of testing prior to construction indicate that there is no potential for methyl-mercury formation, then upon regulatory approval, Ramona Lake will be surcharged to a maximum of 3 meters.</u></li> <li>• The Project no longer includes the SS and CC lakes component and no boring or tunneling will be conducted. Therefore there is no potential for ML/ARD due to boring or tunnel excavation.</li> <li>• <u>Where rock is to be excavated and disposed of, the Proponent commits to conduct ML/ARD testing as per prevailing guidelines to detect such potentiality and commits to the disposition of such rock using approved methods.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>While the concern is expressed about potential impact of acid rock/metal leaching on fish, there is also a concern about the impact this could have on the drinking water supply to the Ramona Creek subdivision which is either sourced from the creek or wells.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should require that NIHP and the province work with the property owners to ensure that there are no negative impacts that would compromise drinking water supply or require the instillation of additional treatment to make the water potable.</b></p> <p><b>The SCR D asks that the property owners assist NIHP and the province achieve a solution.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 2</i></b></p> <p><b>Fish bearing status of several reaches has not been determined.</b> Consequently, the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation is uncertain as well as level of compensation required to render the residual effect non-significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• It is understood that this deficiency relates only to the following reaches: C1 tributary C2 tributary Ramona Creek diversion reach R1 tributary</li> <li>• Both C1 and C2 tributaries will be sampled for fish habitat and fish presence. Fish sampling in C1 may not be possible due to the steep gradient and absence of flow, indicative of non-fish bearing status.</li> <li>• <u>C2 tributary – fish sampling is possible in this tributary and will be conducted in winter 2012/13. The Proponent commits to a 2<sup>nd</sup> year fish absence/presence survey to be conducted.</u></li> <li>• The second year of the fish absence/presence survey on Ramona Creek diversion reach is being conducted to confirm non-fish bearing status.</li> <li>• R1 tributary will be sampled for fish habitat and fish presence. Fish sampling in R1 will be attempted but may not be possible due to the steep gradient and absence of flow, indicative of non-fish bearing status.</li> </ul>	<p><b>The proposed additional studies and adjustments to the project appear to fill the gap.</b></p> <p><b>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>If compensation/mitigation is required the SCRD wants to be informed and have an opportunity to review and comment on any proposals.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 3</i></b></p> <p><b>Several information deficiencies/uncertainties in the IFA have not been addressed including:</b> effects on geomorphology, inadequate transect numbers and measurements at different flows, extrapolation of data from one system to another, the impact of proposed IFRs that are lower than the lowest measured flow is unclear, not all species/life stages present in the system are considered, and the system-specific periodicities of the species/life stages is not known. Consequently, confidence in the result of the IFA is low.</p>		<p><b>Chickwat Creek</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• With the removal of the SS Creek and the CC Creek components from the assessment process, and the elimination of storage effects from these project components, the effects on mean daily flow on the Tzoonie River have been eliminated, as Chickwat Creek does not have a storage component.</li> <li>• Proponent will submit a study by a qualified professional geomorphologist on the impacts of the regulation on the diversion and downstream reaches of Chickwat Creek.</li> <li>• Additional transect surveys have been conducted for Chickwat Creek, and the IFS submission will incorporate the additional data.</li> <li>• <u>The proponent commits to construct and operate a pumped system to convey flow from the powerhouse to the Chickwat Creek anadromous barrier to increase proposed IFR during spawning and incubation periods in the 150 meter anadromous reach above the tailrace confluence.</u></li> <li>• <u>Within the anadromous reach (diversion and downstream of the tailrace confluence), a series of up to 12 periodic surveys to confirm fish species, life stages and periodicities for the species present, and species abundance/distribution will be initiated to improve the understanding of the timing of habitat use.</u></li> <li>• A conceptual design and specifications for the pumped system will be provided by a qualified Professional Engineer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Ramona Creek</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drawdown regime of Ramona Creek has been revised to a maximum of 9 meters for the first year, reducing the storage effects.</li> <li>• A hydrological simulation of the regime will be provided to demonstrate that changes in hydrology in Ramona Creek in the anadromous reach will be within the Coarse Filter Thresholds (Hatfield et al 2003), based on the proposed lake drawdown of 9 meters has been conducted.</li> <li>• An FHAP of the anadromous reach of Ramona Creek will be conducted to characterize habitat quality.</li> <li>• <u>Within the anadromous reach (downstream and diversion), a series of up to 12 periodic surveys to confirm fish species, life stages and periodicities for the species present, and species abundance/distribution will be initiated to improve the understanding of the timing of habitat use.</u></li> <li>• With the completion of foregoing work items, but prior to the operation of the Lower Ramona component, the Proponent will submit an updated instream flow study and may propose an alternative IFR/ lake drawdown regime for review by the regulator.</li> </ul>	<p>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</p> <p>The EAO should make it clear what steps need to be taken if the studies show need for compensation/mitigation. The SCRDR wants to be informed and have an opportunity to review and comment on any proposals.</p> <p>The hydrological study for the 9m drawdown should also consider the proposed phased increases set out above.</p> <p>Should the IFR be established prior to construction? It seems that the proposal is to complete these discussions after construction but prior to operation; is this normal?</p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 4</i></b></p> <p><b>There is uncertainty regarding the feasibility of the Project adhering to the standard DFO ramping rates.</b> No consideration has been given or modeling done to address concerns around simultaneous forced plant shut downs or plant generation changes at the plants with lake storage.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• In particular the potential cumulative effect of SS Creek and CC Creek projects on ramping rates in the Tzoonie River has been eliminated.</li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to using bypass valves in all three projects should they be necessary to avoid significant effects. The bypass valves will assure that under all operational circumstances and events, the mandated ramping rate will be met. However, should ramping studies demonstrate that the risk of significant effects is low, bypass valves will not be installed.</u></li> <li>• A ramping study will be undertaken to identify mesohabitats sensitive to flow change, downstream of the tailrace of Chickwat Creek and downstream of the anadromous barrier of Ramona Creek. The study will arrive at the stage discharge relationships in these sensitive habitats by installing leveloggers, and modeling the effect of operational flow changes on ramping rates and fish stranding in downstream habitats.</li> <li>• The Proponent will provide letter from a qualified professional engineer certifying the ramping behaviour and capabilities of the type of equipment specified (Pelton wheel turbines with instantaneous jet deflectors).</li> <li>• The ramping rate studies will be conducted with bypass valves in place, and alternately without bypass valves.</li> <li>• <u>If the studies deem that the mandated rates can be met without bypass valves, then the Proponent will implement operational regimes to attain the desired ramping rates without bypass valves.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>As noted above there are concerns expressed by owners of the Ramona Creek properties regarding stream flow. Consideration also needs to be given to the impact on stream bank stability within and water supply to the properties.</b></p> <p><b>The qualified professional engineer (or professional with an understanding of stream bank stability) should also comment on the potential impact to the Ramona Creek properties.</b></p> <p><b>The studies and professional advice needs to be made available to the property owners and they should assist in allowing the qualified professional to conduct the research needed, such as provide reasonable access to their properties.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 5</i></b></p> <p><b>Estimates of total riparian losses are not accurate and no consideration has been given to baseline riparian values/conditions at impact sites.</b> Proposed mitigation/compensation may not be adequate to reduce residual effect to non-significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• Ecofish Research will conduct a comprehensive riparian crossing value, impact, and loss study, complete with GIS mapping, model calculations, and a report to be submitted for assessment.</li> <li>• The detailed loss estimates and the proposed mitigation/compensation conceptual plan will be submitted for assessment. Ecofish Research will assess and predict the quantity and quality of riparian habitat loss associated with project construction and operation using GIS mapping and provincial land cover data. Short-term and long-term riparian impacts will be collated in habitat balance sheets and summarized in a report. The collected information will guide appropriate mitigation and compensation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>This is a key information gap that must be filled.</b></p> <p><b>The studies and proposed compensation/mitigation need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b><i>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Information Deficiency 6</i></b></p> <p><b>Lack of baseline data on macroinvertebrate habitat and effect of Project on stream connectivity.</b> Proposed mitigation/compensation may not be adequate to reduce residual effect to non-significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• The completeness of baseline data will be clarified.</li> <li>• The diversion reaches of both Chickwat Creek and Ramona Creek are high gradient, with a predominantly bedrock strata and a confined channel characteristic, and with extensive groundwater collectors.</li> <li>• It is not expected that either stream will dewater.</li> <li>• <u>Proponent commits to a connectivity study conducted at appropriate low-flow conditions. Based on this, and considering experience on other streams, Ecofish Research will provide a professional opinion on the stream connectivity loss risk and the effect of this on fish habitat.</u></li> <li>• <u>The Proponent commits to a connectivity study during project commissioning and commits to increasing the IFR should a loss in connectivity cause a significant effect on fish populations.</u></li> <li>• The assessment of invertebrate production will utilize the abundance and distribution data for pre and post operation evaluation.</li> <li>• To increase the statistical rigor of the pre-operational data, additional invertebrate sampling will be collected prior to plant operation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>The studies need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The SCRD welcomes NIHP's commitment to monitor and respond to loss of connectivity.</b></p> <p><b>The EAO should be clear as to what constitutes a significant effect on fish population.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat</b> <b>Show Stopper 1</b></p> <p><b>Increase in Total Suspended Solids as a result of lake storage.</b> No mitigation is proposed by the Proponent (other than dilution, which is not appropriate). Post-Project TSS levels in SS, CC and Ramona systems will exceed provincial guidelines. This effect can be mitigated by decreasing lake drawdown.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• Both the SS Creek project and the CC Creek project were based on an alpine lake tap with commensurate lake drawdown. Therefore the possibility of excessive TSS levels is now removed from the Tzoonie River and confined to Ramona Creek.</li> <li>• The Proponent will undertake further sediment modeling studies to determine the proposed Ramona Lake drawdown levels proposed do not result in excessive TSS levels exceeding provincial guidelines.</li> <li>• <u>The proposed maximum drawdown for Ramona Lake has been reduced from 45 meters to an incremental drawdown regime that begins with a maximum of 9 meters of proposed drawdown in the first year. Ramona Lake drawdown levels will be reduced to these proposed levels. From the preliminary assessment, it is expected that after three years the proposed levels will be 40% of the previously proposed drawdown and will potentially include seasonal maximum drawdown limits.</u></li> <li>• <u>The approach will be to arrive at the level predicted by the model over a period of three years, starting from a maximum of 9 meters of drawdown. For example if the model predicts the three year level to be 18 meters, then the drawdown level for the first three years are 9, 14, and 18 meters. Thereafter the drawdown will be limited to 3 meters per year, pending regulatory approval. There will be an assessment by a qualified professional each year to sign off on the drawdown for the following year.</u></li> <li>• The results of the modeling studies will be presented to support the revised drawdown levels.</li> <li>• <u>In addition to a reduced drawdown level regime, the Proponent commits to also provide a lake level management and monitoring plan, as part of the Operating Parameters and Procedures Report, for regulatory review. That plan will include:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Details of an adaptive management strategy, to assure compliance to provincial TSS guidelines based on actual empirical turbidity and/or TSS values measured and on the site conditions.</u></li> <li>○ <u>Proponent commits to executing an adaptive management strategy including limiting drawdown levels and curtailing operations to ensure that provincial guidelines are met.</u></li> <li>○ <u>Proponent will provide periodic detail reports and an assessment of the effects.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Some owners of property in the Ramona Creek subdivision are concerned about the impact of changes to the flow regime of Ramona Creek due to damming the lake. Although the property owners directed to the Regional Hydrologist, the SCRD forwarded the concerns to HIHP along with a request that they be addressed. Copy of the relevant letters is attached. Their main concerns are possibility of accelerated bank erosion and increase turbidity.</b></p> <p><b>The phased approach to altering the lake level and monitoring may alleviate some of the concerns. This could be reinforced by the need for a qualified professional to approve the following year's drawdown level. Will the province review the report and agree to the drawdown or will this be left to NIHP to shoulder all the responsibility?</b></p> <p><b>NIHP may need to provide additional water treatment for or compensate Ramona Creek property owners if there is an increase in turbidity that impacts their potable water supply.</b></p>

Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat Show Stopper 2</b></p> <p><b>Proposed Project-related losses to fish habitat significantly exceed those typically allowable by regulatory agencies.</b> Notwithstanding the issues associated with the confidence in the results of the IFA, the proposed losses to fish habitat are as much as 85%. The question becomes whether losses of this magnitude are able to be compensated for so that "no net loss" is achieved. This effect can be mitigated by increasing the proposed IFR.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the removal of SS Creek and CC Creek components from the assessment process, the scope of this issue has been significantly reduced.</li> <li>• The ephemeral fish bearing habitats at the confluence of SS Creek and CC Creek with the Tzoonie River have been removed from the assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Chickwat Creek above the anadromous barrier:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proponent proposes instream compensation, with an appropriate compensation factor, for the resident portion of the diversion reach. This section only contains Dolly Varden char. The fish habitat above the diversion intake is more suitable to the resident species Dolly Varden char than below the intake and compensation may be undertaken in this section.</li> <li>• A risk assessment study will be conducted by Ecofish Research for this reach. This study will evaluate the risks to the Dolly Varden population of habitat losses and consider the effectiveness of a compensation program in eliminating these risks.</li> <li>• Proponent proposes compensation for losses in Dolly Varden char habitat at a suitable compensation factor to meet "no net habitat loss" for the resident section.</li> </ul> <p><b>Chickwat Creek below the anadromous barrier:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The proponent commits to construct and operate a pumped system to convey flow from the powerhouse discharge to the Chickwat Creek anadromous barrier to increase proposed IFR during spawning and incubation periods in the 150 meter anadromous reach above the tailrace confluence.</u></li> <li>• A conceptual design and specifications for the pumping system will be provided by a qualified Professional Engineer.</li> <li>• <u>Proponent anticipates that the habitat loss for the 150 meters of anadromous reach between the fish barrier and tailrace confluence will not exceed 20%. The habitat loss will be compensated by the development of rearing and spawning habitat in lower Chickwat or at the Tzoonie confluence. A conceptual compensation plan will be prepared that identifies the site.</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>The studies and proposed compensation/mitigation need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</b></p> <p><b>The SCR D supports NIHPs commitment to compensate for lost habitat. There may be an opportunity to establish an on-going program of habitat improvement beyond that needed to provide a 1-for-1 compensation. As new work is undertaken to mitigate the impacts of the project it may be that relatively small additional investment can provide significant benefit. The cost of sending a qualified workforce to Narrows Inlet to carry out habitat restoration/improvement for salmon and other fish would already be met. Thus the province and Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Sechelt Nation plus any community groups with an interest in improving fisheries values and fish habitat.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed plan should include estimated costs to avoid a situation where the lack of such could result in concern about viability.</b></p>

(continued on the next page)



Issue	Guidelines	Proponent's Workplan	Comment
<p><b>Freshwater Fish and Fish Habitat</b> <b>Show Stopper 2</b></p>		<p><b>Ramona Creek:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drawdown regime of Ramona Lake has been revised to a maximum of 9 meters in the first year, reducing the storage effects.</li> <li>• A hydrological simulation study of the drawdown regime will be provided to demonstrate that changes in the hydrology of Ramona Creek in the anadromous reach will be within the Coarse Filter Thresholds (Hatfield et al, 2003), based on the proposed lake drawdown of a maximum of 9 meters.</li> <li>• The proponent will meet the coarse filter threshold flows in Ramona Creek in the anadromous section (downstream of the tailrace and the anadromous fish barrier).</li> <li>• For the anadromous reach of Ramona Creek below the tailrace and fish barrier, an FHAP of the reach will be conducted to characterize habitat quantity and quality.</li> <li>• <u>Within the anadromous reach below the barrier, a series of up to 12 periodic surveys to confirm fish species, life stages and periodicities for the species present, and species abundance/distribution will be initiated to improve the understanding of the timing of habitat use.</u></li> <li>• With the completion of foregoing work items, but prior to the operation of the Lower Ramona component, the Proponent will submit an updated instream flow study and may propose an alternative IFR/ lake drawdown regime for review by the regulator.</li> </ul>	<p>The studies and proposed compensation/mitigation need to be publically available as should any analysis from the agency tasked with reviewing it.</p> <p>The SCRД supports NIHPs commitment to compensate for lost habitat. There may be an opportunity to establish an on-going program of habitat improvement beyond that needed to provide a 1-for-1 compensation. As new work is undertaken to mitigate the impacts of the project it may be that relatively small additional investment can provide significant benefit. The cost of sending a qualified workforce to Narrows Inlet to carry out habitat restoration/improvement for salmon and other fish would already be met. Thus the province and Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the Sechelt Nation plus any community groups with an interest in improving fisheries values and fish habitat.</p> <p>The proposed plan should include estimated costs to avoid a situation where the lack of such could result in concern about viability.</p>

**Susan Hunt**

**From:** Cecilia Garcia  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 19, 2013 1:07 PM  
**To:** Susan Hunt  
**Subject:** FW: New Sessions Added - Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshops  
**Attachments:** Additional Workshop Invitation V.2.docx

MAR 19 2013  
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE  
OFFICER

---

**From:** Ormond, Wendy JTST:EX [<mailto:Wendy.Ormond@gov.bc.ca>] **On Behalf Of** Goodwin, Greg JTST:EX  
**Sent:** March-19-13 10:50 AM  
**Subject:** New Sessions Added - Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshops

Greetings,

As a result of strong attendance and community interest for additional workshops, I am pleased to announce that the Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training has added five additional workshops to our successful *Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshop* series. To date, we have held workshops in Burns Lake, Chilliwack, Port McNeill, Kamloops, Terrace, and 100 Mile House.

The workshops have been specifically developed for municipal officials, their staff and First Nations Band Councils, to inform and empower elected community leaders to identify and advance their own unique economic assets and strategies. Listening to regional stakeholders, we have worked to identify central locations for these regionally focused sessions and have aimed to achieve a balance between larger and smaller communities.

In partnership with the regional economic initiative trusts and regional economic development organizations, the sessions will include an overview of economic development basics with a particular emphasis on community investment readiness. The workshops will incorporate regionally tailored material, information on community partnering agencies and other strategic resources. Leaders will be able to apply the tools and techniques learned through the session to build investment potential in their communities.

Please find attached your invitation to attend the Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshop in your area.

**To register, go to:** <http://www.civicinfo.bc.ca/event/RuralBCRegistration.asp>

For further information on the workshops, please contact Wendy Ormond at [Wendy.Ormond@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Wendy.Ormond@gov.bc.ca) or 250-952-0614.

Sincerely,

Greg Goodwin  
Executive Director  
Regional Economic Policy and Projects  
Economic Development Division  
Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training  
7th Floor, 1810 Blanshard St.  
Victoria, BC  
Tel: (250) 356-0778  
[www.bcjobsplan.ca](http://www.bcjobsplan.ca)  
[www.ruralbc.gov.bc.ca](http://www.ruralbc.gov.bc.ca)  
E-mail: [Greg.Goodwin@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Greg.Goodwin@gov.bc.ca)



## The Ministry of Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training

### *invites you to attend an upcoming Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshop*

In response to strong attendance and community requests for additional workshops, the Ministry is pleased to announce the addition of five new workshops to our successful Economic Development Essentials for Local Leaders Workshop series. To date, we have held workshops in Burns Lake, Chilliwack, Port McNeill, Kamloops, Terrace, and 100 Mile House.

The aim of the workshops is to assist community leaders in becoming actively engaged in economic development initiatives in their communities. The workshops have been specially designed for elected local government officials, their staff, and First Nation band councils to better understand their roles in furthering their communities' economic development goals and objectives. Leaders will come away with tools, techniques and actions to build investment potential in their communities.

Workshops will be delivered by the Economic Development Association of BC and will provide an excellent opportunity to connect with provincial, regional and local representatives.

The following topics will be covered at each one day workshop:

Economic Development 101	Business Development
Provincial Role in Economic Development	Tourism Development
Strategic Planning	Workforce Development
Market Development	Tips, Tools and Take-Aways

Workshops have been scheduled as follows:

Northeast	Fort St. John	March 21, 2013
Kootenays	Kimberley	March 25, 2013
Kootenays	Castlegar	March 27, 2013
Nechako	Prince George	April 11, 2013
<b>Additional Workshops:</b>		
Vancouver Island	Victoria	April 3, 2013
Sunshine Coast	Gibsons	April 16, 2013
South Coast	Squamish	April 18, 2013
Kootenays	Revelstoke	April 22, 2013
Okanagan /Boundary	Penticton	April 24, 2013

**If you are a local leader interested in participating, please register and attend an upcoming workshop in your area at: <http://www.civicinfo.bc.ca/event/RuralBCRegistration.asp>**

There is no cost to attend a workshop, however space is limited and we encourage you to register soon. Further information regarding venue locations and session agenda will be provided to registrants.

For more information, please contact:

Wendy Ormond at [Wendy.Ormond@gov.bc.ca](mailto:Wendy.Ormond@gov.bc.ca) or 250-952-0614

