

INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 10, 2022 Held Electronically and Transmitted via the SCRD Boardroom, 1975 Field Road, Sechelt, B.C.

AGENDA

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

AGENDA

1. Adoption of Agenda

PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS

2.	Rebecca Mersereau, Econics Regarding Watershed Business Case	Verbal
REPO	RTS	
3.	Watershed Service Feasibility Study Manager, Strategic Initiatives (Voting – All)	Annex A Pages 1 - 53
4.	BC Engagement on a Proposed Watershed Security Strategy and Fund General Manager, Infrastructure Services Manager, Strategic Initiatives (Voting – AII)	Annex B pp 54 - 64
5.	SCRD's Approach to Archaeology Assessments General Manager, Infrastructure Services (Voting – All)	Annex C pp 65 - 108
6.	Church Road Well Field Project Construction - Update Manager, Capital Projects Regional Water (Voting – A, B, D, E, F, Sechelt)	Annex D pp 109 - 111
7.	Church Road Water Treatment Plant Electrical Power Supply Upgrades Capital Projects Senior Coordinator Regional Water (Voting – A, B, D, E, F, Sechelt)	Annex E pp 112 - 115

8.	Chapman Creek Water Treatment Plant On-site Hypochlorite Generation Project – Contract Amendment No. 2 Capital Projects Senior Coordinator Regional Water (Voting – A, B, D, E, F, Sechelt)	Annex F pp 116 - 118
9.	Green Waste Processing Contract Updates General Manager, Infrastructure Services Regional Solid Waste (Voting – All)	Annex G pp 119 - 122
10.	Vehicle Purchases: RFP 2111604 Award Recommendation Manager, Utility Services Utility Business Coordinator (Voting – All)	Annex H pp 123 - 127
11.	Connected Coast Internet Connectivity Opportunity Chief Administrative Officer (Voting – AII)	Annex I pp 128 - 132

COMMUNICATIONS

NEW BUSINESS

IN CAMERA

That the public be excluded from attendance at the meeting in accordance with:

Section 90 (1) (k) and (2) (b) of the *Community Charter* – "negotiations and related discussion respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public"; and, "the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party".

ADJOURNMENT

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Mia Edbrooke, Manager, Strategic Initiatives

SUBJECT: WATERSHED SERVICE FEASIBILITY STUDY

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Watershed Service Feasibility Study be received for information;

AND THAT the SCRD forward the Watershed Service Feasibility Business Case to the District of Sechelt, Town of Gibsons, Sechelt Indian Government District, shishálh Nation, and Skwxú7mesh Úxwumixw for comment;

AND THAT the Board direct staff to further explore Option 2, increase service levels within existing SCRD Services, and incorporate into future public engagement;

AND FURTHER THAT the remaining project budget will be transferred to [150] Regional Feasibility Studies Operating Reserves.

BACKGROUND

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) provides drinking water and planning services to the community. While the SCRD does not have the mandate for broader watershed protection, as this is the role of the BC Provincial Government and First Nations, the SCRD does have three Water Service Areas and is responsible for providing sufficient safe, clean drinking water to the community. Therefore the SCRD is interested and advocates for watershed protection of its current and potential future drinking water sources.

At its January 30, 2020 Infrastructure Services Committee meeting, staff presented a report titled "Water and Watershed Governance". One outcome of that meeting was a resolution to undertake a feasibility study to improve Watershed Governance in the region, and that the results be forwarded to District of Sechelt, Town of Gibsons, Sechelt Indian Government District, shíshálh Nation, and Skwxú7mesh Úxwumixw for comment (026/20). Further to that, the Board requested staff provide an overview of previous work to improve water and watershed governance at a future Committee meeting (037/20). More recently, the Board requested an update on the status of the Joint Watershed Management Agreement with the shíshálh Nation and the Joint Watershed Management Advisory Committee (003/22).

The purpose of this report to provide background on previous watershed governance initiatives, share the results of the watershed service feasibility business case, and seek direction for next steps for improving watershed protection as it relates to the SCRD's services.

DISCUSSION

Previous work on Water and Watershed Governance

The SCRD was involved in the development of the Chapman and Gray Creeks Integrated Watershed Management Plan between 1990 and 1998. The Province led the development of the plan, that sought to protect water quality and minimize the impact of resource development, and involved several agencies and public input. In 1998, the community rejected the plan in a

referendum, primarily due to public opposition to logging in the watersheds, and the SCRD did not endorse the plan.

The SCRD Watershed Committee was introduced by recommendation of the SCRD Board. These were special meetings of the Infrastructure Services Committee to further discuss watershed issues. Meetings were held in 2008 and 2009.

In response to development pressures in the Chapman Creek Watershed, the SCRD and shishálh Nation signed the Joint Watershed Management Agreement (the Agreement) in 2005, to collaborate towards improved watershed management. The Joint Watershed Management Advisory Committee was created to implement the Agreement, and the membership consisted of SCRD and the shishálh Nation elected representatives, supported by staff from both organizations. The Agreement had a 5-year term, was extended once in 2011, and has since expired in January 2016. The Committee last met in Fall 2015. Given the decreased development pressures in the Chapman Creek Watershed, staff from both organizations do not see the need to reinstate the Agreement and associated Committee at this time.

The Chapman Creek Source Assessment Response Plan was developed in 2011 in response to an order from the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority and to support governing authorities and stakeholders response to previously identified risks to drinking water. A technical advisory committee was set up during the process, to support the development of the plan, with participation from governing authorities, forestry sector, Tetrahedron Outdoor Club, and SCRD staff. The plan was finalized in 2012. The effectiveness of its implementation has been limited as a lot of the proposed initiatives require governing authorities other than the SCRD to take the lead and no mechanisms have been established to arrange for this.

Currently, there is no broad inter-agency work on watershed governance in the region. The SCRD is focused on providing drinking water to users across the region, and therefore has a vested interest in maintaining drinking water sources and preventing impacts upstream within drinking watersheds, in areas often outside the SCRD's mandate. Further to this, as the SCRD continues to expand its water supply systems, protection of future water supply is also an important aspect of work within the SCRD Water Services. The SCRD, like other local governments, is also responsible for the implementation of the *BC Riparian Areas Protection Regulation*, supported by *SCRD Zoning Bylaw No. 310*.

In addition, operational activities include regular water quality testing in drinking water supply watersheds and water conservation education and outreach, and programs such as the rainwater harvesting barrel rebate. Finally, each year, the SCRD provides input on the BC Timber Sales 5-year Operating Plan, and other related engagement opportunities as they arise, to which the SCRD has not supported logging in drinking water supply watersheds, including groundwater sources, or risks to drinking water quality.

Watershed Service Feasibility Study

In 2020, the SCRD Board provided direction to undertake a feasibility study in support of the potential development of a watershed management-oriented service, with a \$25,000 budget to initiate the project. In early 2021, the SCRD was awarded grant funding from the Healthy Watersheds Initiative that allowed the SCRD to complete the feasibility study. The purpose of the project was to explore the benefits, costs, and risks of establishing a regional service for broader watershed protection. A service established under the *BC Local Government Act* gives regional districts the legal mandate to perform activities and collect revenues through fees or tax requisitions, and the initial approach recognized that a new designated service would provide

secure long-term funding to protect watersheds in the region. Other regional districts such as Regional District of Nanaimo and Cowichan Valley Regional District have each established unique Drinking Water and Watershed Protection services.

In July of 2021, the SCRD engaged Econics Services Inc. (Econics) to develop a business case to explore activities or programs that the SCRD could undertake to further protect watersheds in the region, and discuss opportunities for improved inter-agency coordination.

The business case included three options:

- Option 1: Status quo.
- Option 2: Increase service levels within existing SCRD services to conduct some watershed protection activities including drinking water supply and distribution services through the existing regional sustainability service and local and regional planning services.
- Option 3: Establish a new regional watershed protection service similar to other BC regional districts that would enable the SCRD to define a new mandate and would be subject to a referendum.

Development of the Business Case

In Fall 2021, Econics sought to better understand perspectives on the idea of a regional watershed protection service, and to determine the types of activities or programs that could be under this new service. This research engaged governing authority staff, stakeholders, and informed residents in discussion on current watershed protection efforts and needs in the region, and focused on the option of establishing a new regional service in the future.

Econics completed a literature review, conducted twelve interviews with key informants between September and November 2021, and in October 2021, led a workshop with governing authority staff and ran two small focus groups. For the focus groups, Econics engaged a broad range of sectors and organizations, including environmental non-profits, industry, youth, economic development and tourism.

Summary of Feedback

Residents raised concerns about protecting aquatic species and habitat, water quality, and the impacts of climate change. Securing water supply was a key topic throughout the discussions.

The SCRD learned more about the shíshálh Nation's ongoing work with the Province related to land-use planning, which will include watershed governance. shíshálh Nation and the Province will engage the SCRD on this work in the future. In addition, shíshálh Nation agreed that there is important work that they should collaborate with the SCRD on, including monitoring around watersheds used for drinking water supplies.

There was strong feedback about coordination on the topic of watershed protection, both from representatives of governing authorities and community groups. There was no consensus on the subject or participating bodies, or who should lead these efforts. However, at a second governing authorities meeting in January 2022 held to discuss the project outcomes and next steps the idea was further explored and it was agreed that advancing relationships as part of this project, enhanced communication and coordination should be pursued.

3

Finally, there was a range of support for a new watershed protection service. Some of the challenges presented included the overarching issues related to water supply, concerns about cost of the referendum process, and feedback that the benefits of new service would need to be very well defined and clearly communicated. Through the engagement, participants also raised the concern that water supply planning issues are a priority that the SCRD needs to address first, ahead of the establishment of a new watershed protection service.

Recommendations

The business case analysis recommended *increase service levels within existing SCRD services* (Option 2) as the approach that is likely to achieve the greatest benefit. The criteria considered usefulness of watershed protection, ease of implementation, and initial and ongoing costs. The business case also listed different activities that could be pursued under the SCRD's existing services. However, it was acknowledged that to implement these activities, service levels would need to be increased, through additional staff and/or program budgets.

Here some example activities the SCRD could pursue, related to watershed protection:

- Data Gathering, Science, and Knowledge Generation, such as identify recharge areas for aquifers used as SCRD drinking water supplies and protect them through education and/or regulations
- **Education and Outreach**, such as improve public awareness of local water supplies, services, challenges, and priorities
- **Coordination, Partnerships, and Advocacy**, such as create a forum to coordinate watershed protection activities in the region
- **Planning and Policy**, such as incorporate water-related information and data into long-term regional planning policies (e.g., Official Community Plans, regional growth strategy)

Given the feedback received, the SCRD recognizes that additional activities, under its existing services, should primarily focus on its current and future drinking water supply watersheds, planning programs and regulations. A full list of potential activities can be found in Attachment A in Table 1a.

Econics also suggested continuing to increase public awareness of existing plans to address water supply, focusing on the efforts and successes to build confidence in the SCRD's progress towards achieving water security in the region. Econics suggested this could increase future support for expanding future watershed protection initiatives should the SCRD want to pursue additional work in the future, for example, focus on other values of watersheds or watersheds outside drinking water sources.

Timeline for next steps

Subject to receiving Board direction, the SCRD will formally share the business case with governing authorities for their review and feedback in early Spring 2022.

Staff will inform the parties involved in this project about the direction on next steps as provided by the Board.

Staff are currently developing a Water Strategy to guide the SCRD's work on its waters systems for the next 5-10 years. Key initiatives from the business case could be reviewed and incorporated into the engagement for the proposed Water Strategy, scheduled for late Spring 2022. A report on this topic will be presented at the April 14, 2022 Infrastructure Services Committee meeting.

Financial Implications

This project was primarily funded through the Healthy Watersheds Initiative, which is delivered by the Real Estate Foundation of BC and Watersheds BC, with financial support from the Province of British Columbia as part of its \$10-billion COVID-19 response. The funding was awarded to the SCRD in early 2021 and the project must be completed by March 15, 2022.

A secondary funding source was the \$30,000 funded [150] Regional Feasibility Studies approved as part of the 2021 budget process.

If the Board chooses to advance Option 3 (establish a new regional watershed protection service), the current project budget under [150] Regional Feasibility Studies could support future work on this topic. In all other instances the remaining project budget after project completion in April 2022 will be transferred to [150] Regional Feasibility Studies Operating Reserves.

Under the recommended Option 2, staff time required to develop the above-mentioned work plan will need to be absorbed into the budget of the participating services, predominantly [365] North Pender Harbour Water Service, [366] South Pender Harbour Water Service, [370] Regional Water Services, [500] Regional Planning, and [136] Regional Sustainability Services. If the required staff time is limited in nature, staff are confident that this would be possible without this triggering any deficits for these services and that this work can be incorporated into the work plans for these services.

The implementation of further initiatives outlined in the business case would require new budget proposals to increase service levels under the different water, planning or sustainability services.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This project responds to multiple priorities in the SCRD Board's 2019-2023 Strategic Plan. First, to specifically undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers, and pursue watershed governance opportunities for improved protection of watersheds. In addition, the Strategic Plan commits to enhancing First Nations relations and reconciliation, increase intergovernmental collaboration and develop a climate change adaptation strategy, all objectives supported by this project.

CONCLUSION

The SCRD has a mandate to provide and protect drinking water under its existing services. Broader watershed protection is the responsibility of the BC Provincial Government and First Nations. In 2021, the SCRD received grant funding from the Healthy Watersheds Initiative to build on past work related to watershed protection and governance, and explore the SCRD's role within the context of their mandate and existing work related to watershed protection, for example, drinking water testing, water conservation education and outreach, and advocacy.

In 2021, the SCRD hired Econics to develop a business case to explore activities or programs that the SCRD could undertake to further protect watersheds in the region and improve interagency coordination. Econics determined three possible options: the status quo, increase service levels within existing SCRD services, or establish a new regional watershed protection service similar to other BC regional districts. The third option was identified as a way to provide sustainable funding for this potential work.

Econics gathered information through a literature review, interview and focus groups. They engaged members of the community from a wide range of sectors and representatives from governing authorities to better understand different perspectives on the idea of a regional watershed protection service. Overall, the community was supportive of watershed protection as a concept, however there was a strong feedback that the SCRD should focus on increasing water supply first, and therefore a new watershed service may not be successful in the short-term. The shíshálh Nation has ongoing work with the Province related to land-use planning, which will include watershed governance, and will engage the SCRD on this work in the future.

The business case results showed that increasing service levels within existing SCRD services was the approach that is likely to achieve the greatest benefit. To achieve this, however, service levels would need to be increased through additional staff or program budgets. The SCRD also recognizes that these activities should focus on drinking water watersheds, and planning programs and regulations. The SCRD is seeking direction to share the business case with governing authorities, incorporate the potential new activities outlined in the business case as part of future engagement with the community, and transfer the remaining project budget to [150] Regional Feasibility Studies Operating Reserves.

6

Attachments

Attachment A - SCRD Watershed Service Business Case

Reviewed by:			
Manager		Finance	
GM	X - R. Rosenboom X - I. Hall	Legislative	
CAO	X – D. McKinley	Other	

Attachment A

Business Case for a Watershed Protection Service

March 2022

Prepared for



Prepared by

Acknowledgements

Econics and the Sunshine Coast Regional District gratefully acknowledge the participation of all the Sunshine Coast residents, stakeholders, and governing authority staff who contributed to this research. It would not have been possible to complete this work without their invaluable input.

Econics gratefully acknowledges that this research was completed from the traditional territory of the ləkwəŋən peoples represented by the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations and the WSÁNEĆ peoples represented by the Tsartlip, Pauquachin, Tsawout, Tseycum and Malahat Nations. Those who participated in the engagement activities highlighted in this report did so primarily from the territories of the shishálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh, on which the Sunshine Coast Regional District operates.

This work was funded partially by a grant from the Government of British Columbia's Healthy Watershed Initiative, facilitated by the Real Estate Foundation of British Columbia and Watersheds BC.







Disclaimer

The information in this report is for general information purposes only. It is not intended to provide legal advice or opinions of any kind. No one should act, or refrain from acting, based solely upon the materials provided here, any hypertexted links, or other general information without first seeking appropriate legal or other professional advice. The material herein reflects Econics' best judgement based upon the information available at the time of preparation. Any use that a third party makes of this report or any reliance on or decisions made based on it, are the responsibilities of such third parties. Econics accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party because of decisions made or actions based upon this report.

8

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	. 3
1.0 Introduction	. 6
1.1 Methodology	. 6
2.0 The Strategic Context	. 8
2.1 Organizational Overview	. 8
2.2 Overview of Existing Water-Related Services	. 9
2.3 Projects Underway to Improve Water Services	12
2.4 Drivers for Change	13
3.0 The Concept of a Regional Watershed Protection Service	14
3.1 Why Explore a New Regional Service?	14
3.2 Concerns about Watershed Protection in the Region	15
3.3 Potential Watershed Protection Activities	15
3.4 The Service Establishment Process	18
3.5 Assumptions	19
3.6 Dependencies and Risks	19
4.0 High-Level Review of Existing Legislative Authorities	20
4.1 Approach	20
4.2 Overview of Existing Legislative Authorities	21
4.3 Discussion	22
5.0 Options Analysis	25
5.1 Description of Options	25
5.2 Summary of Analysis	25
6.0 Recommended Option	28
6.1 Rationale	28
6.2 Risks	28
6.3 Critical success factors	28
6.4 Recommended Next Steps	29
7.0 Conclusion	31
8.0 References	32
Appendix A: Engagement Materials	35
Appendix B: 'What We Heard' Report Executive Summary	39
Appendix C: Activities and Plans Related to Water Supply and Distribution	41
Appendix D: Fit-Gap Analysis of Watershed Protection Activities with Existing Services	43

Executive Summary

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) is a regional government on BC's Sunshine Coast, serving approximately 30,000 residents in an area encompassing approximately 3,800 square kilometers. SCRD provides over 80 region-wide, sub-regional, and local services, including three water supply and distribution services.

In July of 2021, SCRD engaged Econics to develop a business case to explore establishment of a regional service focused on watershed protection. This initiative stems from a priority identified in SCRD's 2019-2023 Board Strategic Plan:

Undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers.

The option of a new service was explored due to perceived limitations in SCRD's ability to undertake watershed protection activities in watersheds and aquifers that are not used as drinking water supplies. Other contributing factors include recognition of the importance of the non-drinking water values of watersheds (e.g., recreational, ecological, and cultural values), unprecedented drought conditions on the Coast, water supply shortages in the Chapman Creek watershed, recognition of need for an improved inter-agency coordination, and related concerns about climate change. There are also precedents in BC for regional services focused on drinking water and watershed protection, in both the Regional District of Nanaimo and the Cowichan Valley Regional District.

Three project components informed the business case (see the diagram at right):

- community input was gathered through 12 one-on-one and small group interviews with staff and key informants, as well as two 90-minute community focus groups;
- a review of internal and external documents was conducted to provide insight into SCRD's organizational context and identify approaches used in other jurisdictions; and
- two meetings of staff from the key governing authorities in the region were convened on 12 October 2021 and 28 January 2022.



Protection Service

The individuals and organizational representatives engaged during the project identified concerns related to watershed protection, identified over 30 potential activities to address them, and shared perspectives about the desirability and feasibility of a new regional watershed protection service. A notable sentiment shared was that the current preoccupation in the region with urgent water supply challenges may impede public support for a broader watershed focus, if a referendum is used to seek electoral approval for a new service.

To determine whether a new service would be required for SCRD to engage in the watershed protection activities identified during the project, they were reviewed in the context of

SCRD's existing legislative mandates under six services: the three water supply and distribution services (Regional, North, and South Pender Harbour Water Services), the Regional Sustainability Service, the Local Planning Service, and the Regional Planning Service.

Due to the holistic nature of drinking water provision and source water protection practices, the analysis suggests SCRD has considerable latitude to undertake many of the prospective activities under existing water supply and distribution services. It is also notable that some of the highest-priority activities identified by project participants are already underway by SCRD (e.g., water supply planning and metering).

On the other hand, the service mandate review also confirmed that SCRD's mandate under water supply and distribution services has several limitations. For example:

- activities related to gathering water-related data and generating scientific understanding are limited geographically to the watersheds and aquifers used for SCRD's current and future water supplies;
- activities primarily focused on assessing or protecting fish and aquatic ecosystems are outside the scope of all current services;
- activities related to integrating water-related information and constraints into planning regulations can be pursued directly by SCRD only in electoral areas (through local planning services); and
- activities related to education and outreach would focus on SCRD water customers and therefore not encompass the entire region.

Despite these limitations, it appears that SCRD's existing planning and sustainability services may provide alternate avenues to achieve some of the above watershed protection objectives. For example, some watershed monitoring activities could be undertaken under the Regional Sustainability Service mandate due to the nature of climate change risks in the region and SCRD's desire to prioritize climate adaptation.

After the service mandate review confirmed the viability of conducting some of the candidate watershed protection activities under existing SCRD services, an options analysis was conducted to examine the pros and cons these three approaches:

- Option 1: Status quo
- Option 2: Increase service levels within existing SCRD services to conduct some watershed protection activities
- Option 3: Establish a new regional watershed protection service

Three broad criteria were used to facilitate the comparative analysis of the options: efficacy for watershed protection, ease of implementation, and initial and ongoing costs. From the analysis, the *Increase service levels within existing SCRD services* (option 2) emerged as the 'middle-of-the-road' approach that is likely to achieve the greatest benefit in terms of watershed protection, for the least costs, risks, and administrative requirements.¹

Accordingly, the Business Case recommends increasing service levels under SCRD's existing water supply and distribution services and phasing in activities related to watershed protection under these additional services: regional planning, local planning, and regional

¹ It is important to note that considering whether there is sufficient capacity or requisition room within these existing services is beyond the scope of the Business Case report.

sustainability (option 2). In addition to the alignment of watershed protection objectives with several existing SCRD services, this option emerged as a frontrunner because SCRD already has ambitious plans within the next five years to address the most prominent concern identified during engagement: water supply planning to address acute water shortages.

There are several risks that could impede successful implementation of this approach. These include insufficient political or public support to increase taxes/fees to pay for new or enhanced activities under existing services, insufficient organizational capacity, or a lack of participation by other governing authorities in the region. To mitigate these risks, several critical success factors should guide implementation, including:

- increasing public awareness of existing plans to address water supply challenges to build confidence in SCRD's approach, ensure revenue sufficiency, and generate collective action on water conservation; and
- focusing short-term efforts on addressing water supply challenges and communicating progress and successes to the public to enhance support for expanding watershed protection activities.

The following next steps are recommended for SCRD to advance watershed protection in the region, through an expansion of related activities under existing services.

- 1. Develop a multi-year work plan to guide the implementation and prioritization of new and enhanced watershed protection activities under existing services, including details on internal governance structures, staff responsibilities, timelines, organizational and financial implications.
- 2. Continue the dialogue to learn about the interests of the shishalh Nation and Skwxwu7mesh Uxwumixw in conjunction with water supply planning and watershed protection approaches, to explore opportunities to partner in advancing them.
- 3. Develop a concise "strategic blueprint" for SCRD's water-related activities. It should:
 - document existing planned operational activities (e.g., water supply investigations, technical studies, rate review) and consolidate them with new and enhanced watershed protection activities;
 - use a phased approach to ensure sufficient organizational capacity and mitigate financial implications;
 - serve as a communications resource to raise public awareness of SCRD's plans to address water-related challenges; and
 - provide an accountability framework for SCRD to provide regular public updates on progress toward water supply and watershed protection goals.
- 4. Develop annual budget proposals for activities outlined in the strategic blueprint, beginning with the 2023 budget.
- 5. Work with governing authorities in the region to initiate a more collaborative and coordinated approach to water management and watershed protection in the region.
- 6. Re-consider the establishment of a new regional watershed protection service after supplemental water supply and/or conservation measures reduce the frequency and severity of water shortages for the Regional Water Service (target 2027).

1.0 Introduction

In July of 2021, the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) engaged Econics to develop a business case to explore establishment of a regional service focussed on watershed protection. This initiative stems from a priority identified in SCRD's 2019-2023 Board Strategic Plan (SCRD, 2021a):

Undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers.

Throughout this report, the term "service" refers to a service established under Part 10 of the *British Columbia (BC) Local Government Act* (2015). Regional districts in BC may establish and operate any service that their boards of directors consider necessary or desirable for all or part of their area, provided elector and provincial approval is obtained in accordance with the provisions of the *Act*.

This business case report summarizes information gathered about the rationale for a new service, analyzes SCRD's authorities in relation to watershed protection, and evaluates the proposed service relative to both the status quo and an alternative approach of enhancing service levels within existing SCRD services.

Following this introduction, the report format is as follows:

- Section 2 outlines the strategic context for the project, including organizational drivers and current operational priorities and projects;
- Section 3 describes the proposed service in greater detail, highlighting perceived gaps in watershed protection in the region and potential activities it might undertake;
- Section 4 summarizes a "fit-gap" analysis of SCRD's legislative mandates under existing services versus the desired areas of activity under a new service;
- Section 5 summarizes analysis of the options that were considered to achieve the desired watershed protection outcomes; and,
- Section 6 describes the recommended option and implementation considerations.

After considering the results of this business case analysis and advice from SCRD staff, the SCRD Board will determine whether to proceed with seeking elector approval to establish a new watershed protection service, or whether to pursue an alternate approach.

1.1 Methodology

To guide the analysis in this report, three primary methods of information gathering were used. The step-wise methodology is pictured below in Figure 1.

a) A review of internal and external documentation was conducted to provide insight into SCRD's organizational context, to identify approaches used in other jurisdictions, and to inform the review of SCRD's existing service mandates. Documents reviewed include SCRD strategies, service establishment and other bylaws, operational work plans; provincial legislation governing regional districts; and strategies and working documents related to watershed management from other jurisdictions (see the references in Section 8 for a list of documents and files reviewed).

- b) Focussed engagement with targeted community and organizational representatives and stakeholders was conducted from September to November 2021. Engagement techniques included:
 - 12 one-on-one and small group interviews with staff and key informants, (interviews were conducted over Microsoft Teams and lasted between 60 to 120 minutes), and
 - two 90-minute community focus groups held on Microsoft Teams in October 2021 featuring highly engaged community members, youth, and individuals involved in prominent economic sectors in the region (e.g., tourism, agriculture, forestry).
- c) Two meetings of staff from the key governing authorities in the region were convened on 12 October 2021 and 28 January 2022. This involved 12 attendees from SCRD, shishálh Nation, Town of Gibsons, District of Sechelt, and the Provincial Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development.

The engagement activities outlined above were designed to solicit feedback on watershedrelated concerns in the region, as well as the notion of SCRD establishing a new service for watershed protection. The second governing authorities' meeting provided an opportunity for participants to provide feedback on a draft version of this report.

A more detailed description of the methodology for the engagement activities and a summary of the information gathered is in the companion "What We Heard" Report. Materials used for the engagements are in Appendix A: the interview discussion guide, the agenda and attendee list from the first governing authority meeting, and the focus group discussion guide. The executive summary for the "What We Heard" Report is in Appendix B.

The information-gathering activities described above informed the identification of candidate watershed protection activities outlined in Section 3, as well as the review of existing service mandates and analysis of options outlined in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.



Figure 1: Methodology for the Watershed Protection Service Business Case

2.0 The Strategic Context

2.1 Organizational Overview

SCRD is located within the traditional territories of the shishalh Nation and Skwxú7mesh Úxwumixw. SCRD is a regional government on BC's Sunshine Coast, serving approximately 30,000 residents in an area encompassing approximately 3,800 square kilometers of the southern portion of the larger Sunshine Coast region (SCRD, 2021b) (see Figure 2).



Figure 2: Location of the Sunshine Coast Regional District Source: SCRD Maps, 2021c

The SCRD enables shared services between two municipalities, one First Nation, and five electoral areas (see Figure 3). As set out in the *BC Local Government Act* (S. 196, 2015), SCRD is governed by a board of directors with representation from all participating entities, listed below (SCRD, 2015a).

- District of Sechelt
- Town of Gibsons
- Sechelt Indian Government District
- Electoral Area A Egmont/Pender Harbour

- Electoral Area B Halfmoon Bay
- Electoral Area D Roberts Creek
- Electoral Area E Elphinstone
- Electoral Area F West Howe Sound



Figure 3: Municipalities, First Nations, and Electoral Areas in the Sunshine Coast Regional District Source: SCRD (2021b)

SCRD provides over 80 region-wide, sub-regional, and local services, ranging from street lighting to park management to water service provision (SCRD, 2015b). A staff of approximately 215 full-time-equivalent positions support the delivery of these services, organized into five departments (SCRD, 2021b).

In 2021, SCRD had combined capital and operating expenses of almost \$84,000,000 (SCRD, 2021b). As required under the *Local Government Act* (S. 380, 2015), costs for each regional district service are paid for by only the participants of that service.

2.2 Overview of Existing Water-Related Services

All activities currently undertaken by SCRD that relate to water management are provided under the legal authority of three distinct water supply and distribution services:

- the North Pender Harbour Water Service,
- the South Pender Harbour Water Service, and
- the Regional Water Service.

All three water services are governed by the terms of SCRD Bylaw No. 422, 1995 (SCRD, 2021d). The services are administered under separate budgets and rates, with the participants of each service responsible for full-cost recovery of their own service. See Figure 4 on the next page for a map of SCRD's water service areas.

The North Pender Harbour service is supplied by Garden Bay Lake and provides drinking water to approximately 1,200 full and part-time residents of Garden Bay, Irvine's Landing, Daniel Point, and Sakinaw Ridge (SCRD, 2015c). The South Pender Harbour Water Service supplies approximately 2,300 customers with water from McNeil Lake (SCRD, 2015d). Both services provide consistently high-quality water and have relatively abundant water sources.

The Regional Water Service is supplied primarily by a licensed intake on Chapman Creek and provides water to approximately 23,000 residents (SCRD, 2015e). In addition to the Chapman water system, the service includes six small water systems drawn from both surface and groundwater sources. Due to seasonal water shortages in the Chapman water system, SCRD taps into additional groundwater and surface water sources in the summer months (Gray Creek and Chaster Well) to supply some Regional Water Service customers (Opus DaytonKnight Consultants Ltd., 2013).

Historically, concerns and challenges with the Regional Water Service centred around water quality and specifically sedimentation and turbidity that routinely exceeded the treatment system's capability to provide safe drinking water. Notably, between 2005-2015, the SCRD and shishálh Nation signed the Joint Watershed Management Agreement and actively participated in the Joint Water Management Advisory Committee, with the purpose of making recommendations for the management and regulation of the Chapman Watershed.

Since enhancement of the treatment system and the protection of the upper reaches of the watershed in Tetrahedron Provincial Park, concern has shifted to the adequacy of supply for a growing population, particularly in years with prolonged seasonal drought. Supply constraints in the Chapman Creek watershed became particularly acute in 2016 when new Provincial Government environmental flow need requirements significantly reduced water available to the SCRD for its Regional Water Service (R. Rosenboom, personal communication, 2 December 2021).

Increasingly severe and prolonged summer drought conditions in subsequent years have exacerbated supply shortages and occasionally required SCRD to implement Stage 4 water restrictions, which prohibit outdoor water use for all purposes (SCRD, n.d.a). While the impacts have not been quantified, these severe water-use restrictions undoubtedly have adverse effects on the local economy (e.g., tourism and agriculture) and on quality of life for residents.

There are some households in the Regional District that rely on private water systems (e.g., wells, surface water intakes) to meet their domestic needs (M. Edbrooke, personal communication, 2 December 2021). Under existing services, SCRD has no authority to monitor, maintain, or protect the quality or quantity of drinking water for these residents.

Also within the Regional District boundaries, the Town of Gibsons provides water services to approximately 5,000 of its residents, supplied from aquifer 560 (Town of Gibsons, 2017).



Figure 4: SCRD's water service areas

2.3 Projects Underway to Improve Water Services

In response to unprecedented drought and water supply constraints, SCRD has several projects underway to improve water supply security. SCRD's 2013 Comprehensive Regional Water Plan, prepared by Opus DaytonKnight Consultants Ltd. in 2013, is foundational to much of this work. Many of the water-related projects currently underway were conceptualized in that report, such as universal water metering, exploring additional surface and groundwater sources, and improving asset management practices. Activities underway are also guided by the SCRD Board's 2018 policy objective to "supply sufficient water at Stage 2 levels throughout the year to communities dependent on water from the Chapman Creek System" (SCRD, 2018).

The following information about current water supply projects was obtained through personal communication with SCRD staff and the '*Water Projects Summary*' published on SCRD's website (SCRD, n.d.b). These projects are in addition to routine activities related to maintaining and operating the three water supply and distribution services described above. Appendix C contains an overview of operational activities undertaken continuously by SCRD to provide safe and reliable drinking water to its customers.

Water metering

SCRD is working toward universal metering of all residential and commercial water customers to support leak detection, improve water conservation, offset costs associated with expanding water supply and treatment infrastructure, and facilitate more equitable billing (SCRD, 2015f). The final phase of installations will occur in the Sechelt area, beginning in 2022, and a review of water rate structures to support the future adoption of volume-based billing is also proposed for 2022.

After all meters are installed and a volume-based rate structure is adopted by SCRD, it is anticipated that per capita water consumption could decrease by 15 - 40% due to changes in water consumption behaviour and improved detection of leaks, as seen in other jurisdictions (AWE,2022; Ornaghi & Tonin, 2021; Sher, 2016). According to SCRD staff, water consumption has already declined in areas where SCRD has installed water meters, without the introduction of a new water rate structure.

New water supply investigations

Several concurrent initiatives are underway to increase SCRD's water supply for the Regional Water Service. These include upgrading treatment infrastructure for the existing Gray Creek water system to enable use throughout the dry summer months (estimated completion in 2025), and exploring groundwater potential in three well fields:

- Church Road well field (scheduled for completion in 2022),
- Langdale well field (currently under development for completion in 2024/25), and
- in collaboration with the Provincial Government, Town of Gibsons, and Squamish Nation, the Maryanne West Park well field (to be initiated in 2022).

Raw water reservoir project

SCRD has investigated the potential to build a large water reservoir in the Chapman Creek watershed to store and release water as needed during periods of drought. Initial analysis indicated this project would be costly and challenging, so focus has shifted to exploring the new water supply options described above as a short-term priority, before considering a reservoir as a potential long-term water supply source.

Technical analysis to support long-term supply planning

Several technical studies are planned for 2022-24 (pending budget approval) to complement SCRD's efforts to provide more reliable and secure water supply. These include:

- a technical review of SCRD's existing water systems to optimize efficiency in the delivery and distribution of water,
- water demand modelling and analysis to update projections for future needs and consider climate change impacts,
- further exploration of the technical, regulatory, and financial feasibility of developing new groundwater supply sources; and
- a desktop study to confirm the technical, regulatory, and financial feasibility of new potential surface water supply sources.

This technical work will provide foundational information that will be used to develop drinking water supply plans for each of SCRD's water systems. In addition, the SCRD is developing an operational strategic plan for the three water supply and distribution services that will provide direction until 2030 to ensure sufficient long-term water supplies.

2.4 Drivers for Change

SCRD has a long history of involvement and advocacy in watershed protection, centering around a decades-long effort to protect the Chapman Creek (and to a lesser extent Gray Creek) watersheds from the effects of industrial forestry activities. These past efforts were spearheaded by community stakeholders and environmental non-profit organizations, many of whom continue to advocate for improved water security and protection throughout the region.

As noted in the introduction, in its 2019-23 Strategic Plan, the SCRD Board identified a priority to "undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers". (2021a). In addition to this political priority, unprecedented drought conditions on the Coast, water supply shortages in the Chapman Creek watershed, and related concerns about climate change have compounded the need for action.

20

3.0 The Concept of a Regional Watershed Protection Service

This business case analysis is primarily focussed on evaluating the opportunity for SCRD to establish a new service for activities related to watershed protection, as provided for under Section 332 of the *Local Government Act* (2015). This section of the report describes the perceived need and rationale for a new service, functions or activities it could perform, and associated risks and process considerations.

3.1 Why Explore a New Regional Service?

As described in Section 2.3, SCRD has a number of ambitious projects underway to address acute water supply challenges for its Regional Water Service and improve resiliency. However, activities related to protection of watersheds that are not drinking water sources are considered outside the scope of all of existing services, creating an impediment for meaningfully advancing the Board's strategic priority of improving protection for watersheds and aquifers. Furthermore, existing SCRD services are focussed on protecting drinking water values only. More holistic approaches to watershed management additionally recognize and seek to protect several other values:

- recreational values (the ability to safely swim, fish, or otherwise recreate in lakes and rivers);
- ecological values (the ability of a diversity of flora and fauna to persist and sustainably provide a wide range of ecological services); and,
- cultural values (the ability for continued Indigenous or traditional uses of water or freshwater sites of significance).

Increasing water demand, land-use development, and climate change present new and increased risks to aquatic ecosystems and groundwater resources. While multiple agencies play a role in water management within the boundaries of the Regional District, it is acknowledged that management of water quality, quantity, and aquatic ecosystems primarily falls under provincial jurisdiction in BC. It is also acknowledged that the shishalh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw are long-standing stewards of the watersheds and freshwater ecosystems in the region and may aspire to govern these resources differently or directly.

That notwithstanding, the SCRD Board Priority to "undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers" highlights a concern about the absence of a comprehensive plan in the region to balance competing watershed values and coordinate efforts to protect them for current and future residents of the region. Other regional districts in BC have attempted to address this shortcoming by establishing 'drinking water and watershed protection' services. The Regional District of Nanaimo was the first to establish such a service in 2007, followed by the Cowichan Valley Regional District in 2018.

Based on approaches taken by these two regional districts, the functions outlined below would likely fall under a similar new watershed protection service. Assuming the service is regional (i.e., all SCRD member local governments and electoral areas participate), these activities could theoretically be undertaken for all watersheds and aquifers located within the geographic boundaries of the SCRD, provided they do not conflict with the authorities of other governments:

21

- monitoring water quality, quantity, and related environmental conditions;
- improving understanding of the status of and threats to watersheds and aquifers (i.e., scientific analysis);
- increasing awareness and delivering public education programs related to watershed protection;
- aligning land-use planning and regulations with water management objectives;
- coordinating watershed and aquifer monitoring, management, and protection efforts among agencies and organizations; and,
- advocating for enhanced watershed protection action from other agencies.

3.2 Concerns about Watershed Protection in the Region

During the engagement activities completed for this project (i.e., interviews, governing authority meetings, and focus groups), participants had opportunities to highlight concerns related to watershed protection from their individual and organizational perspectives.²

Key concerns included:

- climate change impacts (especially longer and more intense droughts);
- fish mortality and damage to aquatic habitat during droughts;
- pressures from resource use, with limited monitoring and understanding of impacts;
- development impacts on riparian areas and fish habitat;
- the need for effective engagement with First Nations and local governments to meet the Region's needs for water;
- insufficient supply to meet current and future needs (in the Chapman Creek system);
- impacts of water restrictions on the economy, businesses, and quality of life;
- difficulty incentivizing water conservation without equitable water rate structures;
- lack of data and understanding about the status of watersheds (most notably the capacity of groundwater supplies and the location of recharge areas); and,
- the perception that water is plentiful because SCRD is in a rainforest.

3.3 Potential Watershed Protection Activities

Throughout the information-gathering phases of the project, many specific activities related to watershed protection were identified as potential areas for SCRD action. Table 1 on the following pages lists them, organized into four categories of action:

- data gathering, science, and knowledge generation;
- education and outreach;
- coordination, partnerships, and advocacy; and,
- planning and policy.

Each action is also categorized by relative priority (low, medium, high, and very high) based on the importance participants attributed to them. Water supply planning, enhancing water conservation efforts, and coordinating with other organizations and governments were consistently the most frequently cited needs throughout the project engagement.

² Verifying the legitimacy of these concerns by assessing physical impacts to or the status of water resources was beyond the scope of this project.

It is important to note that SCRD is already engaged in many of the activities outlined in Table 1 (as highlighted in Section 2.3 and Appendix C). For example, significant resources are currently directed to water supply planning, and SCRD employs a range of approaches to advance water conservation. However, in many cases project participants were unaware of existing projects (particularly related to water supply planning) or felt the SCRD should enhance existing approaches (a common example of this was improving the effectiveness of communications related to water conservation).

The list of activities in Table 1 encompasses a wide range of activities that SCRD could undertake under the mandate of a new watershed protection service to help protect all water-related values (including drinking water, ecological, recreational, and cultural) in watersheds and aquifers. It is important to underscore that the majority of participants in engagement activities felt that addressing challenges related to existing drinking water supplies should be prioritized over activities in other watersheds or aquifers. Furthermore, a small number of participants expressed the view that the SCRD should continue to focus exclusively on water management activities related to drinking water provision.

Table 1: Potential Watershed Protection Activities

	Activity	Relative Priority
Ref	Data Gathering, Science, and Knowledge Generation	
D1	Identify recharge areas for aquifers used as SCRD drinking water supplies and protect them through education and/or regulations	High
D2	Conduct long-term monitoring to understand climate change impacts (e.g., snowpack, rainfall)	High
D3	Integrate Traditional Knowledge and cultural values with scientific understandings of water resources	Med
D4	Develop a program to monitor surface water quality with partners (e.g., local water stewardship groups)	Med
D5	Develop data collection and management procedures and information systems for data	Low
D6	Develop a framework for prioritizing watersheds and aquifers for resources and action	Low
D7	Improve understanding of hydraulic connectivity between surface water and groundwater to avoid impacts to aquatic ecosystems	Low
D8	Develop a hydrometric monitoring program to improve understanding of aquatic ecosystems, water availability, and to monitor climate change	Low
D9	Develop a program to monitor groundwater quality and quantity, assess aquifer vulnerability, and monitor for saltwater intrusion and contamination	Low
D10	Conduct watershed assessments to understand their status and risks	Low
D11	1 Conduct biological monitoring to assess and monitor the ecological function of watersheds	
	Education and Outreach	
E1	Water conservation education and outreach for residents (full-time and seasonal)	High
E2	Improve public awareness of local water supplies, services, challenges, and priorities	High
E3	Develop and deliver educational programs on watersheds for the public and schools	High
E4	Develop and deliver water conservation education and outreach for tourists	Med
E5	Improve signage of water supply areas	Med
E6	Survey residents to understand attitudes and behaviours related to water use and watershed protection	Med
E7	Provide more rebates and other incentives for rainwater harvesting	Med
E8	Provide educational tours of water supply areas and/or demonstration sites for water efficiency and stewardship	Low
E9	Provide educational resources for safe use of private wells and septic systems	Low
E10	Publish reports documenting the status and risks for watersheds and aquifers	Low

Activity			
Ref	Coordination, Partnerships, and Advocacy		
C1	Create a forum to coordinate watershed protection activities in the region	Very high	
C2	Advocate to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure for improved stormwater management in electoral areas to reduce flooding and impacts on aquatic ecosystems	Med	
C3	Improve the protective status of water supplies through provincial legislative tools Me		
C4	Support partners and non-governmental organizations with water monitoring (e.g., equipment, training, data collection protocols, data management support)		
C5	Coordinate with other agencies on monitoring water quality and quantity Med		
C6	Remove barriers to fish passage (e.g., poor culverts)	Low	
C7	Improve urban stormwater management through servicing regulations		
C8	Provide grant funding to partners and non-governmental organizations for water stewardship activities		
Ref	Planning and Policy		
P1	Water supply planning	Very high	
P2	Complete universal metering	High	
P3	Conduct water demand analysis for water supply and distribution services	High	
P4	Implement equitable water rates	High	
P5	Incorporate water-related information and data into long-term regional planning policies (e.g., official community plans, regional growth strategy)	Med	
P6	Integrate water-related information and data into regulations to influence land-use decisions in electoral areas (e.g., zoning bylaw, servicing requirements)	Med	
P7	Develop regulations and educational materials to protect riparian areas	Med	
P8	Enable rainwater and greywater use through regulations	Low	
P9	Reduce water use in new buildings through development regulations	Low	
P10	Develop a rainwater management strategy	Low	

3.4 The Service Establishment Process

As noted above, Part 10 of the *BC Local Government Act* (2015) guides the structure and establishment of regional district services. At a high level, the process includes these steps:

- develop a service establishing bylaw that clearly describes the service provided, the service boundaries, service participants, and the method of cost recovery;
- seek elector approval from those who would receive and pay for the service; and,
- seek statutory approval of the bylaw by the Inspector of Municipalities.

The *Act* also provides for three approaches to obtain elector and participating area approval for new services: referendums of electors in the proposed service areas (S. 336), alternate approval processes (S. 345), and consent by municipal councils or regional district boards on behalf of municipal or electoral participating areas (S. 345 and 346, respectively).

25

3.5 Assumptions

Based on historical conventions, it is assumed throughout this report that SCRD would use a referendum to seek electoral approval for a regional watershed protection service. This matches the process used by the Regional District of Nanaimo and the Cowichan Valley Regional District, where electors supported establishing a new service. It is further assumed that, if a new regional watershed protection service is established, the entire geographic area encompassed by the Regional District jurisdictional boundaries and all of the watersheds wholly or partly contained therein would be within the service area.

Under a new regional watershed protection service, the SCRD's regulatory powers related to watershed governance would not change. That is, the existing division of authorities between federal, provincial, and First Nations governments and local agencies would not be altered with the establishment of a new service.

Finally, it is assumed that additional planning to refine the scope of activities and level of service would be undertaken collaboratively with other governing authorities in the region, if a new service is established.

3.6 Dependencies and Risks

Among other things, the effectiveness of a new service will depend on the availability of sufficient financial resources and organizational capacity to undertake the proposed new or enhanced activities. It is noted that service budgets are approved by the SCRD Board annually, in consideration of desired service levels and competing organizational priorities.

Given the multi-jurisdictional nature of watershed protection and the limited regulatory powers of the Regional District, the willingness and capacity of key partners to support the service will have a significant bearing on its success. The engagement activities revealed there is interest in collaborating more with SCRD (from both non-governmental organizations and governing authorities), whether to support existing services or a new service.

The information gathered during engagement activities also highlighted a risk of insufficient public support for a successful referendum outcome. A related risk identified is that even conducting the referendum in the near future may have a negative impact on SCRD's organizational reputation. A common sentiment from those who participated in the project is that the current preoccupation in the region with urgent water supply challenges may impede public support for a broader watershed focus. Some felt SCRD should not attempt to establish a new watershed protection service unless or until tangible and meaningful progress is made to address annual water shortage issues.

A minority of participants expressed a view that SCRD is not the best candidate, nor is sufficiently or appropriately resourced to address gaps in watershed protection outside of existing community watersheds, regardless of timing. The shishálh Nation highlighted their ongoing work with the Province related to land-use planning which will include watershed governance. Representatives noted that the shishálh Nation and the Province will engage SCRD in this work and suggested that SCRD should focus on development of drinking water. The shishalh Nation agreed that there is important work where they should collaborate with the SCRD, including monitoring around watersheds used for drinking water supplies.

4.0 Review of Existing Legislative Authorities

To determine whether the activities listed in Table 1 could be performed under existing service mandates, a review of the Regional District's current legislative authorities was conducted. In addition to the three water-related services introduced in Section 2, this included consideration of SCRD's Regional Sustainability Service and the Rural and Regional Planning Services. This was due to the potential linkages between these service mandates and the activities of interest related to watershed protection.

4.1 Approach

In accordance with advice from the BC Ministry of Municipal Affairs (J. Apolonio & B. Nicolls, personal communication, 10 January, 2022), the review of SCRD's existing legislative mandates consisted of reviewing service establishment bylaws where they exist, and considering operational plans and priorities for services without them (i.e., general services).

Information about SCRD's existing legislative authorities was retrieved primarily from these internal sources of information:

- Bylaw No. 1002: the service establishment bylaw for the Regional Water Service (SCRD 1990),
- Bylaw No. 1070: the service establishment bylaw for the North Pender Harbour Water Service (SCRD, 2006),
- Bylaw No. 1074: the service establishment bylaw for the South Pender Harbour Water Service (SCRD, 2007),
- Bylaw No. 422 to "regulate the rates and operation of the water supply and distribution system" (SCRD, 2021d),
- SCRD's 2022 Divisional 'Lite' Service Plans' (2021e), and
- SCRD's 2022 round 1 budget proposals for regional sustainability, regional and rural planning, and water services (regional, North and South Pender Harbour) (2021f).

A summary of the purpose of each of the services reviewed is outlined in Section 4.2, along with potential linkages to watershed protection activities. Due to the very general service descriptions in the establishing bylaws for SCRD's water supply and distribution services³, additional guidance on the nature of activities required to fulfil water supply and distribution mandates was obtained from the following sources:

- the BC *Drinking Water Protection Act* (2001) and Drinking Water Protection Regulation (2018),
- the Comprehensive Drinking Water Source-to-Tap Assessment Guideline (Province of BC, 2010),
- the Small Water System Guidebook (Province of BC, 2017), and
- the Okanagan Basin Water Board's updated Source Water Protection Toolkit (2021).

To further assess the potential for SCRD to undertake new or enhanced watershed protection activities under these existing services, evaluation of the candidate activities listed in Table 1 was conducted using a fit-gap analysis approach. Used primarily in the information technology

³ Bylaw 1002 refers to the "function of water supply and distribution" and Bylaws 1070 and 1074 refer more generally to "provid[ing] water services".

realm, fit-gap analysis is a method of assessing how well an existing organizational structure (or software product) fits a set of business needs (or technology requirements) (Infotivity Technologies, 2020). In this case, the potential watershed protection activities were compared to existing service authorities to identify gaps, or activities SCRD could not likely undertake under existing services. The results are presented in summary tables in Appendix D. A discussion of key findings is below in Section 4.3.

4.2 Overview of Existing Legislative Authorities

4.2.1 Drinking Water Supply and Distribution

At a high level, SCRD's authority under the existing water supply and distribution services enables activities related to managing and monitoring water supplies and distributing water services to service participants, in accordance with provincial regulations. Based on the expertise of the consulting team and the sources of information listed above, the following activities are considered routine in the provision of drinking water services:

- building, operating, and maintaining infrastructure required to collect and distribute drinking water from approved water supplies;
- planning for the future provision of safe and secure drinking water;
- monitoring raw (i.e., source) and treated water quality, pursuant to the provision of safe drinking water that meets regulatory requirements;
- assessing risks to safe and secure water supplies and implementing mitigation measures such as education campaigns and regulations to support source protection;
- collaborating and coordinating with landowners, stakeholders, and government agencies with decision-making authority to reduce risks to drinking water sources;
- approving or discontinuing water service connections;
- requiring and administering the use of water meters for new or existing connections;
- developing and delivering voluntary and mandatory water conservation initiatives;
- providing information and communication with rate payers related to the service;
- charging fees to recover costs associated with service provision; and
- public reporting in accordance with the BC Drinking Water Protection Act (2001).

4.2.2 Regional Sustainability Services

SCRD operates two sustainability services: 1) the Corporate Sustainability Service, which focusses on assessing and reducing SCRD's organizational greenhouse gas emissions, and 2) the Regional Sustainability Service, which focusses on reducing community emissions and helping residents throughout the region adapt to climate change.

Near-term priorities under the Regional Sustainability Service include a Community Climate Plan, with a focus on climate change adaptation and building resilience, and a climate change vulnerability assessment (SCRD, 2021f). The water-related impacts of climate change have significant potential to impact public health and safety, emergency preparedness, and environmental values. Consequently, investing resources in monitoring and assessing these impacts in order to implement and improve adaptation measures may be justifiable under the Regional Sustainability Service.

4.2.3 Regional Planning Service

To coordinate growth management and development approaches across the region, SCRD has a Regional Planning Service. Examples of upcoming activities under the Regional Planning Service include conducting baseline research for a Regional Growth Strategy and implementing recommendations from the recently completed Sunshine Coast Housing Needs Report (SCRD, 2021e; SCRD, 2020).

SCRD does not have authority over land-use planning in the Town of Gibsons, District of Sechelt, Crown lands, or over the lands and waters of the shishalh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. However, through the Regional Planning Service, SCRD could encourage the adoption of land-use planning practices or regulations that support more effective management of water in these other jurisdictions. One way to achieve this is developing region-wide policies through a regional growth strategy to guide all jurisdictions. Another is researching and developing model bylaws or similar regulatory guidance to streamline their adoption by other governing agencies. For example, this 'capacity-building' approach could be used to advance greywater use in the region, protect riparian areas, or promote waterefficient development requirements.

4.2.4 Rural Planning Services

SCRD is responsible for managing growth and development in its electoral areas. This work is organized under Rural Planning Services and involves developing planning policies and regulations (e.g., Official Community Plans, zoning bylaws) as well as adjudicating development applications. This work is supported by the SCRD's Planning and the Development Committee Advisory Planning Commissions comprised of appointed volunteers for each electoral area.

As a result of its land-use planning role in electoral areas, SCRD has direct authority to implement planning policies and regulations to improve water management, such as the examples described above (enabling grey water use, requiring water-conserving features in new developments, and improving the protection of riparian areas). The forthcoming project to harmonize and modernize Official Community Plans may provide an opportunity to implement some of these policy objectives in SCRD's electoral areas.

4.3 Discussion

It is clear from the fit-gap analysis presented in full in Appendix D that the holistic nature of drinking water provision and source water protection practices provide considerable latitude for SCRD to undertake many of the candidate activities under existing water supply and distribution services. It is also notable that most of the highest-priority activities can be undertaken under these water-related services, and many are already underway (e.g., water supply planning and metering).

SCRD's mandate under water supply and distribution services does have several limitations; however, existing planning and sustainability services may provide alternate avenues to achieve watershed protection objectives. These limitations are highlighted below as four key findings, followed by alternate approaches SCRD can consider.

29

Key Finding #1: Activities related to gathering water-related data and generating scientific understanding are limited geographically to the watersheds and aquifers used for SCRD's current and future water supply areas

Consideration:

• Water monitoring is likely to be expanded to additional watersheds and/or aquifers in the near future (e.g., aquifer 560), as SCRD brings supplemental sources online for the Regional Water Service.

Alternate approaches:

• Monitoring water quality or quantity in non-drinking water sources that are indicator or otherwise significant watersheds or aquifers could likely be performed under the existing Regional Sustainability Service to support climate change impact monitoring and adaptation efforts.

Key Finding #2: Activities primarily focused on assessing or protecting fish and aquatic ecosystems are outside the scope of all current services

Alternate approaches:

- The SCRD could establish stormwater monitoring services that could provide services for municipalities/First Nations and electoral areas, resulting in routine water quality monitoring in creeks and streams, investigations into causes of pollution, and remediation/corrective measures, all of which indirectly support fish habitat protection.
- SCRD may be able to support monitoring of fish populations through partnerships with non-governmental organizations (e.g., Streamkeepers), First Nations, post-secondary institutions, and/or senior governments. Forms of support may include data sharing, provision of grant funding or equipment, or communicating results to the public, and could likely be ancillary to Rural Planning Services where Official Community Plans have policies related to aquatic ecosystem protection.

Key Finding #3: Activities related to integrating water-related information and constraints into planning regulations can be pursued directly by SCRD only in electoral areas (through local planning services)

Alternate approaches:

- Through the Regional Planning Service, SCRD can encourage the adoption of regulations and best practices by municipalities and First Nations (for example in a regional growth strategy, by developing model bylaws, or otherwise helping to build capacity and awareness).
- SCRD's forthcoming multi-year project to modernize and harmonize Official Community Plans may present an opportunity to integrate water-related considerations into land-use planning in electoral areas.

Key Finding #4: Activities related to education and outreach would focus on SCRD water customers and therefore not encompass the entire region

Consideration:

• Residents of the region who are not SCRD water customers (e.g., residents of Gibsons and users of private water systems) are not targeted by education and outreach campaigns provided under existing water services. However, the diffuse nature of many education and outreach activities (educational events, newspaper/radio advertisements, online publications, social media) means most are likely to benefit and have an effect in the entire region.

Alternate approaches:

- Due to the high likelihood and consequence of climate change impacts on water resources on the Sunshine Coast, developing educational materials related to water conservation and watershed stewardship for use throughout the entire region may be justifiable to support climate adaptation under the Regional Sustainability Service.
- Education related to private water systems (e.g., wells) and septic systems may be justified under local area services where Official Community Plans contain objectives and policy statements related to protecting the aquatic environment.⁴
- In specific instances where non-SCRD water customers are excluded (e.g., rebates for rainwater barrels, educational signage, education related to watering restrictions), a fee-for-service or other contractual agreement with excluded parties could enable SCRD to expand the target area.

In sum, based on the purpose of the existing services described above, it appears possible to perform most of watershed protection activities identified through this project under existing SCRD services. Considering whether there is sufficient capacity or requisition room within these existing services is beyond the scope of this report. However, the recommendations and implementation considerations in Section 6 account for the need to assess and plan for service level enhancements.

⁴ For example, Objective 3.2.3 in the Egmont/Pender Harbour Official Community Plan (2018) is "To protect the quality and quantity of tidal, non-tidal and watercourse areas and groundwater sources and surrounding riparian areas for the purpose of maintaining the natural environment as well as drinking water supply sources". Also, Objective 3.6.1 is "To identify and protect surface and ground water supply sources from contamination and diversion". Neither objective is in specific reference to community or SCRD's water supply areas, and the OCP acknowledges the existence of private water systems in the local area.

5.0 Options Analysis

Based on the work plan and engagement results, the project team identified the three options below to compare different governance approaches for SCRD to pursue improved watershed stewardship.

5.1 Description of Options

Option 1: Status quo

The status quo option assumes that SCRD's current approach will continue largely unchanged. That means existing services would carry on with the same scope and levels of service, as planned prior to the initiation of this project (i.e., current and planned activities outlined in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 would continue).

Option 2: Increase service levels within existing SCRD services

This option would fulfill the desire for increased watershed protection activities within existing SCRD services, to the extent possible within current legislative authorities. These existing services include SCRD's three water supply and distribution services, sustainability and planning services, as described in Section 4.2, above. Based on the analysis outlined in Appendix D, it is assumed that a change in the purpose or scope of these existing services is not necessary to accommodate this change, though service level enhancements would be necessary.

Option 3: Establish a new regional water protection service

This option involves establishing a new region-wide service for watershed protection using the provisions of the *Local Government Act* (2015), enabling SCRD to undertake activities in all aquifers and watersheds within the regional district boundaries, pursuant to improved water protection. The analysis below assumes service establishment would require a successful regional referendum.

Note: A sub-regional service option was identified at the outset of the project but was not pursued for further analysis after engagement activities due to a lack of apparent interest or need.⁵

5.2 Approach

The three options described above were compared and contrasted according to three broad criteria, described below. Due to the significant number of variations possible within each option in terms of levels of service and the nature of activities undertaken, the analysis is cursory and comparative (i.e., findings are relative to the other options).

Efficacy for watershed protection

To what extent are the options likely to improve watershed protection in the short-(<5 years) and long-term (>5 years)?

^{4.} A sub-regional service for watershed protection would consist of any subset of SCRD's member local and First Nations governments and electoral areas, rather than all eight.

Ease of implementation

What are the administrative requirements associated with initiating and maintaining the option? What capacity considerations and organizational risk factors are associated with the options?

Initial and ongoing costs

What are the relative initial (i.e., set up) and ongoing (i.e., administrative) costs of the options?

Table 2 contains a summary of the comparative analysis, using colour coding to visualize the gradient of 'positive results' (green represents the most positive, yellow represents medium results, and red as the least desired). Key findings from the analysis are presented below in Section 5.3.

5.3 Key findings

When compared relative to each other, analysis of the three options revealed the following:

- the status quo approach (option 1) has the least impact on costs and organizational capacity, but is likely to be the least effective in terms of addressing watershed protection priorities (the most apparent gaps include coordination between agencies, new conservation programs, long-term monitoring networks);
- expanding existing services (option 2) would enable SCRD to achieve more watershed protection priorities identified through the project, with a moderate and scalable impact on costs and organizational capacity; and
- establishing a new service (option 3) would enable SCRD to undertake all of the watershed protection activities of interest through a concerted organizational focus and dedicated funding source, but it is likely to have higher costs overall (both initial and ongoing) and is associated with higher administrative requirements and organizational risks.

Expanding existing services (option 2) emerged as the 'middle-of-the-road' approach that is likely to achieve the greatest benefit in terms of watershed protection, for the least costs and administrative requirements. It is acknowledged that this option is highly scalable and could be implemented using a wide range of service levels and watershed protection activities. Section 6 provides some parameters and recommended next steps to guide implementation of this approach.

Relative to the establishment of a new service focussed on watershed protection, option 2 has many constraints. Working within existing service mandates will require will restrict SCRD's latitude both in terms of the types of activities it undertakes and where it undertakes them. It will not enable the same level of concerted and enduring regional and organizational focus on watershed protection that has transpired in other regional districts that have regional watershed protection services. However, it is apparent that there are many important priorities for SCRD to attend to in the near-term that do not require the formality and structure of a new service.

	Option 1 (Status Quo)	Option 2 (Expand Existing Services)	Option 3 (New Service)
Relative efficacy for watershed protection	 Activities would not be performed in/for the benefit of watersheds or aquifers not used for drinking water purposes Apparent gaps in activities will not be addressed (e.g., coordination between agencies, new conservation programs, long-term monitoring networks) 	 More watershed protection activities could be undertaken in watersheds and aquifers used for drinking water purposes and incrementally in select other watersheds/aquifers as other activities are phased into operational plans for existing services (e.g., sustainability and planning services) Watershed protection principles are integrated into the work of several service areas, reducing organizational silos and increasing awareness and capacity across the organization 	 Activities could be performed in any watersheds or aquifers in the region, and to protect a wide range of values (e.g., ecological, recreational, cultural) A new service could result in both short-term and long-term improvements due to dedicated funding and a higher profile politically, organizationally, and in the community Service mandates can offer more secure funding and facilitate long-term organizational focus
Relative ease of implem- entation	 New bylaws or bylaw amendments are not required Existing operational plans and staffing contingent remain the same Without additional effort or service level adjustments, SCRD may face reputational risk related to annual water supply challenges 	 New bylaws or bylaw amendments are not required unless requisition limits are insufficient Existing operational plans and staffing complements would require revision to increase service levels A dedicated 'point person' or 'champion' is less likely to be established, resulting in more diffuse responsibilities and potentially greater challenges making progress and monitoring results Enhanced service levels provide an opportunity to enhance SCRD's organizational reputation in water management Increases in service levels can be phased in over time, and service-by-service 	 A service establishment bylaw must be drafted and approved by electors, the Board, and the Province New operational plans and staff positions would be required to support and guide the new service A new service offering may create short-term capacity challenges (even with a phase in) Distinct services can reduce financial risk for the activities they fund May help improve organizational reputation by signalling a renewed effort and a new approach for the SCRD vis-à-vis water management A new service could result in real or perceived conflicts with work underway by shishálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw in land-use planning and watershed governance A referendum, particularly if unsuccessful, could increase political and organizational risk
Relative costs	 No impact on requisitions or fees (either initially or ongoing) 	 No initial (implementation) costs Ongoing costs depend on service levels but will result in added costs for existing service participants Costs to advance watershed protection can be spread across several service areas and phased in over time No ongoing overhead associated with a new service 	 Holding a referendum has considerable costs (estimated at approximately \$100,000) Ongoing costs depend on service levels but a minimum requisition equivalent to \$10/parcel is advised to launch a new service
Colour legen	d High e Easy to imp L	efficacy Medium efficacy lement Moderate ease of implementation ow cost Medium cost	Low efficacy Hard to implement High cost
6.0 Recommended Option

Based on the analysis of the three options summarized in Section 5, **Option 2 (increase service levels within existing SCRD services) is recommended.** This would entail increasing the level of capacity and activity under SCRD's existing water supply and distribution services and phasing in activities related to watershed protection under these additional services: regional planning, rural planning, and regional sustainability.

6.1 Rationale

This recommendation is based primarily on the favourable results of the review of existing service mandates, which suggested many watershed protection activities of interest, particularly the highest priority activities, can likely be undertaken under the mandates of existing SCRD services. Other important advantages of this option include the avoided financial costs and potential risks to organizational reputation associated with establishing a new regional service. Participants in project engagement activities also highlighted a risk of an unsuccessful referendum due to the need for SCRD to first demonstrate progress on addressing seasonal water supply shortages.

Another finding that supports the recommendation is that SCRD already has ambitious plans within the next five years to address the most prominent concern identified during engagement: water supply planning to address acute water shortages. With modest additional effort across several service areas over a multi-year implementation timeline, SCRD is in a position to address additional shortcomings in watershed protection in the region and make meaningful progress.

6.2 Risks

The following risks could impact the successful implementation of the recommended option:

- insufficient political or public support to increase taxes or fees to pay for new or enhanced activities under existing services;
- capacity challenges and/or competing priorities under the existing services, or the absence of a single point person or 'champion', could delay progress on implementing new or enhanced watershed protection activities, or could result in only the most acute challenges (e.g., short-term water supply provision) being addressed;
- without the formality of a new service with regional participation and focussed broadly on watershed protection, governing agencies may be less inclined to participate in a coordinating function (e.g., a staff working group); and,
- ecological, cultural, and recreational values associated with local watersheds and aquifers may not be documented, recognized, or factored into decision-making at all, or to the same extent they would be under a new watershed protection service.

6.3 Critical Success Factors

In light of the risks highlighted above and information gathered throughout the project, a number of 'critical success factors' have been identified to support successful implementation of the recommended option.

- Increase public awareness of existing plans to address water supply challenges in order to build confidence in SCRD's approach, ensure revenue sufficiency, and generate collective action on water conservation.
- Use a phased approach to implement new watershed protection activities to achieve early successes, ensure sufficient organizational capacity, and smooth out financial and tax implications.
- Focus short-term efforts on addressing water supply challenges and communicating progress and successes to the public to achieve buy-in for expanding watershed protection activities.
- When seeking to improve coordination with other agencies, anticipate and facilitate the different preferences of governing authorities to engage at different levels of the discussion (e.g., watershed-level, region-wide level) and in different ways (e.g., leading/chairing, observing, sharing written updates).
- Continue to engage the shishalh Nation and Skwxwu7mesh Uxwumixw in discussion to understand their aspirations for water governance, and to deliver water-related services to the Nations that align with their needs, values, and interests.
- Ensure watershed protection is recognized as a corporate priority throughout SCRD (e.g., through alignment of operational and strategic plans and cross-departmental implementation teams) to encourage and enable the cross-departmental collaboration required to achieve water protection objectives under multiple services.
- When selecting and prioritizing new or enhanced watershed protection measures for SCRD action, recognize co-benefits that will also protect the ecological, cultural, and recreational values of watersheds and aquifers.
- Consider a variety of options for service delivery of new watershed protection activities, including in-house delivery, contracting to qualified service providers, and granting to partnering non-profit organizations.

6.4 Recommended Next Steps

In consideration of the above risks and critical success factors, the following next steps are recommended.

- 1. Develop a multi-year work plan to guide the implementation and prioritization of new and enhanced watershed protection activities under existing services, including details on internal governance structures, staff responsibilities, timelines, organizational and financial implications.
- 2. Continue the dialogue to learn about the interests of the shishalh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw in conjunction with water supply planning and watershed protection approaches, to explore opportunities to partner in advancing them.
- 3. Develop a concise "strategic blueprint" for SCRD's water-related activities. It should:
 - document existing planned operational activities (e.g., water supply investigations, technical studies, rate review) and consolidate them with new and enhanced watershed protection activities;
 - use a phased approach to ensure sufficient organizational capacity and mitigate financial implications;

36

- serve as a communications resource to raise public awareness of SCRD's plans to address water-related challenges; and
- provide an accountability framework for SCRD to provide regular public updates on progress toward water supply and watershed protection goals.
- 4. Develop annual budget proposals for activities outlined in the strategic blueprint, beginning with the 2023 budget.
- 5. Work with governing authorities in the region to initiate a more collaborative and coordinated approach to water management and watershed protection in the region.
- 6. Re-consider the establishment of a new regional watershed protection service after supplemental water supply and/or conservation measures reduce the frequency and severity of water shortages for the Regional Water Service (target 2027).

7.0 Conclusion

This report explores the question of whether SCRD should consider establishing a new regional service to enhance protection of watersheds and aquifers within its boundaries. After desktop analysis and engagement with key stakeholders, organizations, and agencies, the highest-priority actions appear to be achievable through existing SCRD water supply and distribution services. In fact, many are already underway. Furthermore, it appears that many of the activities contemplated for enhancing watershed protection can also be accommodated through other SCRD services including regional and local planning, and regional sustainability.

Consequently, to reduce costs and administrative requirements, and avoid the potential for organizational risks, it is recommended that SCRD increase service levels within existing services to advance watershed protection, focussing in the near term on addressing acute water supply shortages and communicating out on progress and outcomes.

To take on new or enhanced activities identified in this report, SCRD will need to balance existing operational priorities and undertake service-level planning to phase in changes, being cognizant of organizational capacity and cost implications. Developing a "strategic blueprint" to communicate the breadth of SCRD's water-related activities is an important next step to consolidate existing work with new priorities and increase public confidence in SCRD's water provision and stewardship roles.

8.0 References

- Alliance for Water Efficiency. 2022. *Metering and Submetering*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.allianceforwaterefficiency.org/resources/metering</u>
- Cowichan Valley Regional District (CVRD). 2018. Bylaw No. 4204: A Bylaw to Establish a Service for Drinking Water and Watershed Protection. Retrieved from https://www.cvrd.ca/DocumentCenter/View/90699/4202
- Drinking Water Protection Act, SBC 2001, c 9. Retrieved from http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/01009_01
- Drinking Water Protection Regulation, BC Reg 237/2018. Retrieved from http://www.bclaws.ca/EPLibraries/bclaws_new/document/ID/freeside/200_2003
- Econics. 2021. What We Heard Summary. Prepared for SCRD for the Business Case for a Watershed Protection Service Project.
- Infotivity Technologies. 2020. *Fit-Gap Analysis*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.infotivity.com/fit-gap.html</u>
- Local Government Act, RSBC 2015, c 1. Retrieved from https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/r15001_10#section342
- Okanagan Basin Water Board. 2021. Source Water Protection Toolkit. Retrieved from <u>https://sourcewaterprotectiontoolkit.ca/wp-content/uploads/source-water-protection-toolkit.pdf</u>
- Ornahi, C & M. Tonin. 2021. The effects of the Universal Metering Program on Water Consumption, Welfare and Equity. Oxford Economic Papers 73(1), P. 399-422. Retrieved from https://academic.oup.com/oep/article/73/1/399/5620404
- Opus DaytonKnight Consultants Ltd. 2013. Comprehensive Regional Water Plan. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Infrastructure/Water/2013-JUN-</u> 21%20CRWP%20Final%20A.pdf
- Province of British Columbia. 2017. Small Water System Guidebook. Retrieved from <u>https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/air-land-</u> <u>water/water/waterquality/monitoring-water-quality/small_water_system_guidebook_-</u> january_2017.pdf
- Province of British Columbia Ministry of Healthy Living & Sport. 2010. Comprehensive Drinking Water Source-to-tap Assessment Guide. Retrieved from <u>https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/air-land-water/water/waterquality/drinking-water-quality/resources-for-water-system-operators#source-to-tapassessment</u>
- Regional District of Nanaimo (RDN). 2008. Bylaw No. 1556: A Bylaw to Establish a Drinking Water and Watershed Protection Service. Retrieved from https://www.rdn.bc.ca/cms/wpattachments/wpID2501atID7171.pdf

- Sher, C. 2016. Water Sub-metering to Promote Water Efficiency: A Survey of Existing Literature and Local Case Studies. Greenest City Scholar Program. Retrieved from <u>https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/water-conservation-</u> pdf/reports/submetering2016finalreport_gcscholars.pdf?sfvrsn=adc939ca_2
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). N.d.a. *Water Conservation Regulations*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Infrastructure/Water/2020-</u> ALL%20Watering%20Regulations%20-%20FLYER.pdf
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). N.d.b. *Water Project Summary*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Infrastructure/Water/2021-</u> <u>Water%20Projects%20One%20Pager%20Handout.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021a. *Strategic Plan: 2019-2024*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Administration/2021-SCRD%20Strategic%20Plan%20-%202019-2023.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021b. 2021-2025 Financial Plan. Retrieved from 2021-06-24 SCRD Financial Plan Version 7- Final with Award.pdf

Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021c. SCRD Maps. Retrieved from https://maps.scrd.ca

- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021d. Bylaw No. 422: A Bylaw to Regulate the Rates and Operation of the Water Supply and Distribution System of the Sunshine Coast Regional District. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Administration/Bylaws/422%20consolidated%20to%20include</u> %20422.38%20%28in%20effect%20from%202021-AUG-17%20to%20present%29.pdf
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021e. *Divisional Service Plans Lite Version*. P. 180. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Administration/Agendas/2021/2021-DEC-13%20to%2015%20CAS%20Agenda%20R1%20Special%20PACKAGE.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2021f. 2022 Round 1 Budget Proposals. P. 305. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Administration/Agendas/2021/2021-DEC-</u> <u>13%20to%2015%20CAS%20Agenda%20R1%20Special%20PACKAGE.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2018. *Staff Report on 2018 Water Demand Analysis*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Infrastructure/Water/ANNEX_H_-_2018-Dec-13_PCD_staff_report_Updated_Water_Demand_Analysis_-_COMBINED.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015a. *Board of Directors*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/about-the-board</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015b. *Our Services*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/about-the-board</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015c. North Pender Harbour Water System. Retrieved from https://www.scrd.ca/North-Pender-Harbour
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015d. South Pender Harbour Water System. Retrieved from https://www.scrd.ca/South-Pender-Harbour

- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015e. *Comprehensive Regional Water Plan (CRWP)*. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/Comprehensive-Regional-Water-Plan</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2015f. Water Meter Program Summary. Retrieved from <u>https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/Infrastructure/Water/2021-</u> <u>March%20Water%20Meter%20Program%20Summary.pdf</u>
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2007. South Pender Harbour Water Service Establishing Bylaw No. 1074.
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2006. North Pender Harbour Water Service Establishing Bylaw No. 1070.
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 2018. Egmont/Pender Harbour Official Community Plan. Retrieved from http://hh3.scrd.ca/files/File/Community/Planning/Area%20A%200CP/2018-Oct-25%200CP%20Attachment%20A%20Bylaw%20708%203rd%20reading%20as%20amended%20and% 20adoption.pdf
- Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). 1990. A Bylaw to Convert the Function of Water Supply and Distribution to a Local Service: Bylaw No. 1002.
- Town of Gibsons. 2017. Water Supply Strategy Update. Retrieved from https://gibsons.civicweb.net/document/19155
- Urban Matters. 2020. Sunshine Coast Housing Needs Report. Retrieved from https://www.scrd.ca/files/File/2020-10-01_SUNSHINECOAST_HNR-FINAL.pdf

Appendix A: Engagement Materials

Exploring a Watershed Management Service for the SCRD Interview Discussion Guide

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) is exploring development of regional or sub-regional programs to improve watershed management. This initiative responds to two priorities in SCRD's 2019-2023 Strategic Plan:

- develop a strategic action plan for protection of watersheds and aquifers, and
- pursue opportunities for improved water governance and protection of watersheds.

The SCRD currently does not provide services such as monitoring watersheds or educating residents about source water protection. Some of these functions fall under Provincial Government jurisdiction. However, local governments in BC are increasingly stepping into the fold in response to growing public interest and intensifying impacts of climate change. For example, the Regional District of Nanaimo established a Drinking Water and Watershed Protection Service in 2009, followed by the Cowichan Valley Regional District in 2018. These programs provide education and stewardship opportunities for residents. They also help improve science and knowledge about water resources to support more sustainable land use planning decisions.

In addition to gathering input from First Nations, other agencies, and stakeholders, SCRD will develop a comprehensive business case report by December 2021. This will examine the potential of new watershed management programs. Informed by input from interviews and other research in the fall, the business case will outline costs, opportunities, challenges, risks, and other considerations for the SCRD Board of Directors. This work is supported by Victoria-based consulting firm Econics (www.econics.com).

The questions below will guide our scheduled interview, which will take about an hour. More information about the project and how your input will be used will be provided at the start of the interview. Meanwhile, if you have any questions or concerns, please contact Kirk Stinchcombe at kirk@econics.com or +1 250 588-6851.

Discussion Questions

- 1. Do you feel there is a gap or gaps in watershed monitoring, management, and/or protection in the Sunshine Coast Region? What are they and do you know how they have come about?
- 2. Do you feel these gaps <u>can</u> be addressed by the regional district?
- 3. Do you feel these gaps <u>should</u> be addressed by the regional district? If so, which role(s) should SCRD play in particular?
- 4. What are the top water-related issues across the region? What is contributing to them?
- 5. Are there parts of the region or watersheds where these issues are particularly acute?
- 6. Who are some key partners SCRD could work with in watershed protection and management? Are there specific roles they (i.e., the individuals or organizations mentioned) could play?
- 7. What are some challenges SCRD might encounter if it establishes watershed management programs? Do you have any thoughts on how to avoid or mitigate these?
- 8. What would successful management and protection of freshwater and/or drinking water in the region look like?
- 9. Is there anyone you recommend we talk to gather important information or perspectives?

econics S

Agenda

What: Watershed Governing Authorities Meeting 1

- When: Tuesday October 12 1 to 3 pm
- Who: Remko Rosemboom, SCRD Mia Edbrooke, SCRD Julie Clark, SCRD Shane Walkey, SCRD Isabelle Houde, shishalh Nation TBD, Squamish Nation Meghan Lee, District of Sechelt

Andrew Allen, District of Sechelt Kirn Dhillon, District of Sechelt Dave Newman, Town of Gibsons Michelle Lewis, Town of Gibsons Michele Lepitre, FLNRORD Rebecca Mersereau, Econics Kirk Stinchcombe, Econics

- Where: Virtual Meeting Via Microsoft Teams Meeting Link Meeting ID: 399 313 014# Call In # (if required): (833) 442-0421
- Why: To gather input from First Nations, local government, Provincial Government and SCRD staff (the governing authorities) on possible creation of a SCRD sub-regional or regional watershed protection service
- 1. Introductions
- 2. Project overview
- 3. Key watershed management issues
- 4. Possible elements of a watershed protection service
- 5. Next steps

Notes:

Facilitator: Kirk Stinchcombe, Econics (cell: 250 588 6851; kirk@econics.com

When: 27 & 28 October Duration: 7pm for 75 to 90 minutes How: Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

The questions below will only guide discussion; the facilitators will adjust questions and topics based on participant responses.

Introduction (~10 minutes)

- Welcome
- Introduce facilitator
- Territorial acknowledgement
- How the information will be used
 - Meeting will be recorded
 - \circ $\,$ May use brief quotes in the reports we write
 - However, quotes will not be attributed to individual people and your names will not appear in any of the reports we submit to SCRD
- We understand that people here representing themselves as individual citizens rather than various organizations, although it is understood that some of you are also part of organizations with interests in the issues we will be talking about. In short, we don't assume you are speaking on behalf of anyone else.
- Round table introduction

Watershed protection issues (~20 minutes)

- Do you think people on the Sunshine Coast do enough to conserve water in their homes?
- What are the most pressing water-related issues facing the Sunshine Coast?

 Probe with specific examples if required}
- What are examples of things that you think government agencies should be doing now to protect water and watersheds that are not happening?
 - Who do you think should do these things?
 - Why do you think it is not happening already?

SCRD programs (~30 minutes)

- Is there anything you think SCRD specifically should be doing to protect drinking water and watersheds that it doesn't appear to be doing?
- Are there any functions in watershed management or protection that the regional district should absolutely <u>not</u> do?

→ Reveal re services under the Local Government Act and RDN's program

[At this point in the discussion, the facilitators will provide a short overview of how a watershed protection service under the *Local Government Act* might work, using Regional District of Nanaimo's established program to illustrate]

- Knowing a bit more about what other regional districts are doing and what is required to set up a watershed protection service, does this change your ideas about what SCRD should do to protect watersheds and drinking water?
- These services in other regions focus broadly on both protecting drinking water (for users on public systems and private wells), as well as on watersheds and aquatic ecosystems not used for drinking water.
 - Do you think this same broad focus is appropriate for the SCRD? Why/why not?
- What kind of cost, per parcel, do you think would be appropriate as a tax levy to fund a watershed protection service?
 - What do you think the willingness to pay of the general public is, for a new service of this kind?
 - {Probe with RDN or CVRD examples if required}
- What kind of outcomes would you be expecting and wanting from this new service after 2 years? After 10 years?
- If a new service is established for 2023, what should the #1 priority be?

Challenges and Obstacles (~10 minutes)

- What do you think the main challenges would be to establish a watershed protection service in the first place, recognizing that this will probably require a referendum?
 - Do you think a referendum is likely to be successful? Why or why not?
 - What should SCRD do before the referendum to increase the chances of success?
- What do you think will be the main challenges with delivering these kinds of services once the service is established?
 - What can SCRD do to prepare for these challenges?

Wrap Up (~10 minutes)

• As we wrap up, I want to go around the table and get you to tell me: what is your biggest takeaway from this session this evening?

45

Appendix B: 'What We Heard' Report Executive Summary

SCRD offers a broad range of services to residents, including supply and distribution of drinking water to three different service areas.⁶ However, SCRD does not currently have a service that focusses specifically on watershed protection. These have been established elsewhere in the province, specifically in the Regional District of Nanaimo and Cowichan Valley Regional District.

In July of 2021, the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) engaged Econics to develop a business case to outline the benefits, costs, and risks of establishing a regional service focussed on watershed protection. This initiative stems from a priority identified in SCRD's 2019-2023 Board Strategic Plan:

Undertake a feasibility study to create a new regional service for the protection of watersheds and aquifers.

Before moving forward to establish such a service, it is important to assess the views and perspectives of those affected. The purpose of this report is to summarize findings from research conducted in the fall of 2021. This research engaged governing authority staff, stakeholders, and informed residents in discussion on current watershed protection efforts and needs in the region, and gauged reactions to the option of SCRD establishing a regional watershed protection service.

Data for this report was drawn from the three primary sources: 1) interviews with key informants; 2) a virtual workshop with staff from governing authorities including SCRD, shishálh Nation, Town of Gibsons, District of Sechelt, and the Provincial Government; and, 3) two virtual focus groups involving a total of 16 residents who are familiar with watershed protection issues facing the region.

What we heard includes the following:

- When it comes to key goals for watershed protection, people are interested in safeguarding fish and fish habitat, water quality, and managing growing threats such as climate change. However, there is a preoccupation at the present time at least with long-term water supply security for people and communities.
- When it comes to what people would want from a watershed protection service, perceived benefits include improved data and information, more community outreach, and better land-use planning. However, most interest lies in the "data/information" and "communications/outreach" themes, which are seen as missing pre-requisites to more effective planning that integrates water considerations with land-use decisions.
- There is strong agreement that better coordination among agencies responsible for watershed protection on the Sunshine Coast is needed. However, while there is consensus that <u>someone</u> needs to take a leadership role, there is no consensus that this responsibility naturally lies with SCRD.

⁶ Throughout this report, the term "service" is used specifically to mean a service established under Part 10 of the *Local Government Act*, which enables a regional district to set up and operate any service that the Board of Directors considers necessary or desirable for all or part of its area.

- Representatives from the shishalh Nation highlighted that they have ongoing work with the Province related to land-use planning, which will include watershed governance. The noted that the shishalh Nation and the Province will engage SCRD in this work and suggested that SCRD should focus on development of drinking water.
- We did not speak to representatives of Squamish Nation or the Government of Canada during this research. As a result, we are unable to make any comments on the views of either government on any of issues discussed in this report.
- On the question of whether SCRD should establish a watershed protection service, responses varied from highly enthusiastic to ambivalence to opposition. Some thought that a public referendum on this matter would face an uphill battle to attain majority support. General cynicism about water supply management may cloud perceptions and tip the scales away from resident endorsement.
- Cost would also be an issue, and this would come down to perceived value. Residents would need to be told exactly what this kind of service will cost them on tax bills and what they will get out of it in return. They would expect concrete, short-term benefits.
- A successful referendum outcome will require sophisticated communications. Leveraging support from stewardship groups and other partners will also be critical.

These findings will inform the next stage of the project, which involves preparing a business case report that will assess both the benefits and risks of SCRD establishing a watershed protection service, as well as other options it may have to achieve watershed protection outcomes. This next report will be completed in early 2022.

Appendix C: Activities and Plans Related to Water Supply and Distribution

Activities/Plans		Details		
	Community talks/events	In recent years, SCRD has occasionally (3-5 times/year) hosted "Let's Talk Water" events to raise awareness of water-related projects and challenges (videos are subsequently posted to the <u>SCRD YouTube channel</u>)		
	Educational videos	Videos: In addition to the "Let's Talk Water" events, SCRD occasionally posts videos about water-related topics or conditions to its <u>YouTube Channel</u>		
Public Education and	Published resources	SCRD's <u>Water Services Division webpage</u> hosts extensive information about all three water supply and distribution services, projects currently underway, water conservation regulations, links to foundational strategy documents (e.g. the Comprehensive Regional Water Plan), and links to educational videos.		
Outreach	Rainwater harvesting rebate	Under the <u>Rainwater Harvesting Rebate Program</u> , SCRD currently offers rebates of up to \$1,000 for water customers who install rainwater harvesting systems (rebates depend on the size of the storage system).		
	Leak Notification Program	The <u>Leak Notification Program</u> enables metered water customers an opportunity to sign up to be notified by email about their water use and potential leak status.		
	Water wise gardening resources	SCRD's <u>water wise gardening webpage</u> hosts information to support residents in adopting water-efficient gardening techniques, including a <u>Water Wise Plant Guide</u> .		
Domand	Water conservation regulations	The <u>water conservation regulations</u> regulate outdoor water used annually from May 1 to September 30, using an escalating four stage approach.		
Management and Drought Response	Drought response Plan	The <u>Drought Response Plan</u> outlines procedures to manage demand for drinking water during the summer months or during other unforeseen water shortage situations such as emergencies or major service disruptions. It provides guidance on decision criteria and protocols for the water use restrictions as well as guidance on public communications.		
Asset	Water main upgrades	Watermain construction projects are continuous to allow for timeline replacement of old and undersized water mains, and to improve fire flows, water quality, and overall system reliability. Recent and upcoming watermain construction projects are outlined on <u>SCRD's website</u> .		
management	Water metering program	SCRD's universal <u>water metering program</u> is nearing completion, with Sechelt residents scheduled for the final phase in 2022. Staff are proposing a water rate review in 2023 to support a transition to volume-based billing. In conjunction with		

	Supply and demand modelling	Integrated Sustainability consultants performed <u>water demand</u> <u>analysis</u> (p. 222 - 261) for the Chapman water system to support feasibility investigations of a raw water reservoir project.			
	Water Quality Monitoring	SCRD routinely monitors water quality throughout all of the water systems it operates, in accordance with regulatory requirements. The results of monitoring activities are published <u>on the website</u> , and summary data is included in its annual Utility Services Report.			
Water Supply	Comprehensive Regional Water Plan	The <u>Comprehensive Regional Water Plan (CRWP)</u> documents a review of the Regional Water Service Area and provides direction for the SCRD to meet the sustainability goals as identified in the 2011 We Envision Plan and the Corporate Strategic Plan, guiding water conservation and system expansion / improvement measures to accommodate growth projections identified in the various Official Community Plans to the year 2036.			
and System Planning and Management	Area A Water Master Plan (2007) and Plan Update (2011)	The <u>Area A Water Master Plan</u> establishes general directions to address drinking water issues in Area A (Egmont/Pender Harbour) and provides a general framework to improve water systems to achieve the overall objectives. The 2011 <u>plan update</u> captures the thoughts of, and dialogue between, SCRD staff and the major stakeholders to make the 2007 plan current to 2010.			
	Well Protection Plan	A <u>Well Protection Plan</u> is in place to improve the safety of groundwater supply sources serving Langdale, Chaster, Soames, Granthams, and Eastbourne (Keats Island). It identifies and ranks hazards to the water sources and contains an action plan to mitigate them.			
	Chapman Creek Source Assessment Response Plan	The <u>Chapman Creek Source Assessment Response Plan</u> (SARP) specifies management measures to mitigate hazards to the community drinking water. The SARP consists of a set of actions that, once implemented, will ensure that the risks to drinking water quality within the Chapman Creek watershed are minimized.			

Appendix D: Fit-Gap Analysis of Watershed Protection Activities with Existing Services

Fit-Gap Analysis of Data-Gathering, Science, and Knowledge-Generation Activities

Ref	Activity	Potential Enabling Service ⁷	Limitations and Other Considerations
D1	Identify recharge areas for aquifers used as SCRD drinking water supplies and protect them through education and/or regulations	WSD	Could be conducted only for aquifers used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D2	Develop a program to monitor groundwater quality and quantity, assess aquifer vulnerability, and monitor for saltwater intrusion and contamination	WSD	Could be conducted only for aquifers used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D3	Improve understanding of hydraulic connectivity between surface water and groundwater to avoid impacts to aquatic ecosystems	WSD	Could be conducted only for aquifers and watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D4	Develop a hydrometric monitoring program to improve understanding of aquatic ecosystems, water availability, and to monitor climate change	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D5	Integrate Traditional Knowledge and cultural values with scientific understandings of water resources	WSD RPS LPS	WSD: could be conducted only for aquifers and watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies RPS/LPS: could be conducted throughout the entire Regional District in conjunction regional planning initiatives (e.g., Regional Growth Strategy) or in local areas through Official Community Plans
D6	Develop a program to monitor surface water quality with partners (e.g., Streamkeepers)	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D7	Develop data collection and management procedures and information systems for data	WSD	Existing procedures and systems likely existing and should be standardized and formalized to support expanded data collection activities
D8	Develop a framework for prioritizing watersheds and aquifers for resources and action	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D9	Conduct long-term monitoring to understand climate change impacts (e.g., snowpack, rainfall)	WSD RSS	WSD: could be conducted only for aquifers and watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies RSS: could be conducted throughout the entire Regional District
D10	Monitor fish habitat and fish populations	N/A	Fish habitat monitoring may be an indirect outcome of stormwater monitoring and management services (see CRD, n.d.)
D11	Conduct watershed assessments to understand their status and risks	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
D12	Conduct biological monitoring to assess and monitor the ecological function of watersheds	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies

⁷ WSD = Water supply and distribution services (Regional, North and South Pender Harbour), RSS = Regional Sustainability Service, RPS = Regional Planning Service, LPS = Local Planning Services

Fit-Gap Analysis of Education and Outreach Activities

Limitations and Other Considerations	Enabling SCRD Service ⁸	f Activity	Ref
WSD: Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishálh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)		Water conservation education and outreach for residents (full-time and seasonal)	E1
Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishálh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)	WSD	Improve public awareness of local water supplies, services, challenges, and priorities	E2
Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishalh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)		Develop and deliver educational programs on watersheds for the public and schools	E3
Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishálh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)	WSD	Water conservation education and outreach for tourists	E4
Permission would be required from property owners (e.g., the Province)		Improve signage of water supply areas	E5
WSD: Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishalh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems) RPS: surveys or other market research strategies that include water-related topics could be	WSD RPS	Survey residents to understand attitudes and behaviours related to water use and watershed protection	E6
used to gather baseline data for a Regional Growth Strategy Could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishalh Nation, households, and businesses on private water systems)	WSD	 Provide rebates and other incentives for rainwater harvesting 	E7
Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishalh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)	WSD	Provide educational tours of water supply areas and/or demonstration sites for water efficiency and stewardship	E8
Could be undertaken in electoral areas with policy objectives related to aquatic ecosystem protection and/or general water supply protection (e.g., in Official Community Plans)	LPS	Provide educational resources for safe use of private wells and septic systems	E9
Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activities could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shishálh Nation, households and businesses on private water systems)	WSD	 Publish reports documenting the status and risks for watersheds and aquifers 	E10
 Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shouseholds and businesses on private water systems) Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shouseholds and businesses on private water systems) RSS: could be conducted throughout the Region to advance climate adapt content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, shouseholds and businesses on private water systems) Permission would be required from property owners (e.g., the Province) WSD: Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and not target audiences that are not SCRD water services and water systems on target audiences that are not SCRD water services and water systems on target audiences that are not SCRD water services and water systems on target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibson households and businesses on private water systems) RPS: surveys or other market research strategies that include water-relaused to gather baseline data for a Regional Growth Strategy Could not target audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Nation, households, and businesses on private water systems) Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, inouseholds and businesses on private water systems) Content must relate to SCRD water services and water systems and activitarget audiences that are not SCRD water clients (residents of Gibsons, households and businesses on private water systems) Could be undertaken in electoral areas with policy objectives related to protectio	WSD WSD RSS WSD WSD WSD WSD LPS WSD	Improve public awareness of local water supplies, services, challenges, and prioritiesDevelop and deliver educational programs on watersheds for the public and schoolsWater conservation education and outreach for touristsImprove signage of water supply areasSurvey residents to understand attitudes and behaviours related to water use and watershed protectionProvide rebates and other incentives for rainwater harvestingProvide educational tours of water supply areas and/or demonstration sites for water efficiency and stewardshipProvide educational resources for safe use of private wells and septic systemsPublish reports documenting the status and risks for watersheds and aquifers	E2 E3 E4 E5 E6 E7 E8 E9 E10

⁸ WSD = Water supply and distribution services (Regional, North and South Pender Harbour), RSS = Regional Sustainability Service, RPS = Regional Planning Service, LPS = Local Planning Services

Fit-Gap Analysis of Coordination, Partnerships, and Advocacy Activities

Ref	Activity	Potential Enabling SCRD Service ⁹	Limitations and Other Considerations
			The structure and scope of the forum will dictate how and if SCRD can be involved.
C1	Provide a forum to coordinate watershed/ aquifer protection activities	WSD RGS	WSD: Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
			RGS: may be possible if coordination on watersheds/aquifers is a Board strategic priority or an action in a regional plan (e.g., regional growth strategy)
C2	Advocate to the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure for improved stormwater management in electoral areas to reduce flooding and impacts on aquatic ecosystems	LPS	Local governments in BC have previously advocated to the Province for improved stormwater management in rural areas (see Comox Valley Regional District, 2012), to little or no effect.
			A stormwater monitoring service could be established to monitor stormwater runoff, identify site-specific challenges, and address them through education and cooperatively working with private property owners (see CRD, n.d.).
С3	Improve the protective status of water supplies through provincial legislative tools	WSD	SCRD would need to advocate to the Province to enhance the protective status of water supplies (e.g., through Community Watershed or land reserve designations)
C4	Support partners and non-governmental organizations with water monitoring (e.g., equipment, training, data collection protocols, data management support)	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
C5	Coordinate with other agencies on monitoring water quality and quantity	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies
C6	Remove barriers to fish passage (e.g., poor culverts)	N/A	N/A
С7	Improve urban stormwater management through servicing regulations	RP	Municipalities and First Nations can be encouraged but not compelled by SCRD to improve stormwater management regulations.
C8	Provide grant funding to partners and non- governmental organizations for water stewardship activities	WSD	Could be conducted only for watersheds used as current drinking water supplies or potential future drinking water supplies

⁹ WSD = Water supply and distribution services (Regional, North & South Pender Harbour), RSS = Regional Sustainability Service, RPS = Regional Planning Service, LPS = Local Planning Services

Fit-Gap Analysis of Planning and Policy Activities

Ref	Activity	Potential Enabling Service ¹⁰	Limitations and Other Considerations
P1	Water supply planning	WSD	To fulfill its mandate to provide reliable, safe water services, SCRD could investigate new surface and groundwater supplies and conduct associated activities (data collection, analysis) within or outside its legal boundaries
P2	Complete universal metering	WSD	Water users with private water systems or residing on shíshálh Nation reserve lands would not be metered
P3	Conduct water demand analysis for water supply and distribution services	WSD	Planned for 2022
P4	Implement equitable water rates	WSD	Water rate structures adopted by SCRD would not apply to non- residents of Gibsons, shishalh Nation, households, and businesses on private water systems)
P5	Incorporate water-related information and data into long-term regional planning policies (e.g., official community plans, regional growth strategy)	RPS	RPS: SCRD could incorporate water-related knowledge into a regional growth strategy; however, municipalities and First Nations can be encouraged but not compelled by SCRD to incorporate water-related knowledge into their planning processes and practices
P6	Integrate water-related information and data into regulations to influence land-use decisions in electoral areas (e.g., zoning bylaw, servicing requirements)	LPS	LPS: SCRD can use planning tools (e.g. Official Community Plans, zoning bylaws, development permit areas) to integrate water knowledge into regulations and practices in electoral areas
Р7	Develop regulations and educational materials to protect riparian areas	LPS RPS	LPS: SCRD can establish regulations for riparian protection in electoral areas RPS: municipalities and First Nations can be encouraged but not compelled by SCRD to establish regulations and practices that protect riparian areas
P8	Enable grey water use through regulations	LPS RPS	LPS: SCRD can enable grey water use through planning regulations in electoral areas RPS: municipalities and First Nations can be encouraged but not compelled by SCRD to enable grey water use through planning regulations
Р9	Reduce water use in new buildings through development regulations	LPS RPS	LPS: SCRD can establish requirements for new construction in electoral areas through regulatory tools (e.g. zoning bylaws, development permits) RPS: municipalities and First Nations can be encouraged but not compelled by SCRD to establish requirements to reduce water use in new construction
P10	Develop a rainwater management strategy	RPS	A strategy could be developed for the region to guide SCRD in establishing regulations and educational approaches in electoral areas and to guide municipalities and First Nations in their own approaches.

¹⁰ WSD = Water supply and distribution services (Regional, North and South Pender Harbour), RSS = Regional Sustainability Service, RPS = Regional Planning Service, LPS = Local Planning Services

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

- TO: Infrastructure Services Committee March 10, 2022
- **AUTHOR:** Remko Rosenboom, General Manager, Infrastructure Services Mia Edbrooke, Manager, Strategic Initiatives

SUBJECT: BC ENGAGEMENT ON A PROPOSED WATERSHED SECURITY STRATEGY AND FUND

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled BC Engagement on a Proposed Watershed Security Strategy and Fund be received for information;

AND THAT the SCRD submit feedback on the BC Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper as included in Attachment A;

AND FURTHER THAT these recommendations are brought forward to the March 10, 2022 Board meeting.

BACKGROUND

The SCRD recognizes the importance of watershed protection to community values, as expressed in SCRD Official Community Plans, Regional Sustainability Plan and the Agricultural Area Plan. Many downstream community values are dependent on the integrity of upslope watersheds. The *BC Riparian Areas Protection Regulation* directs local governments to implement and enforce the regulation through Development Permit Areas for private property. In addition, the SCRD and residents are increasingly experiencing climate impacts relating to either drought or intense water flow, through flooding, debris floods and erosion. Some impacts could be prevented or mitigated with holistic watershed level planning, monitoring, and cumulative effects analysis, in collaboration with stakeholders in watersheds.

Broad watershed protection is not within the current mandate of the SCRD. Rather, the SCRD focuses on watershed protection of drinking water sources and provision of clean drinking water to its water users. Through this work, the SCRD does some water quality testing of drinking water sources, provides feedback to BC Timber Sales about activities within drinking watersheds, and runs outreach and education programs related to drinking water. Additional background information has been included in a report titled, "Watershed Service Feasibility Study", included as Item 3 in this agenda package.

The purpose of this report is to present a response to the "BC Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper" discussion paper and seek SCRD Board direction to submit this response.

DISCUSSION

On January 25, 2022, the BC Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy launched an engagement on the development of a Watershed Security Strategy and Fund. Feedback on the discussion paper was invited, with a deadline to submit a response by March 18, 2022 through an online questionnaire or written submission.

Page 2 of 2

Through the discussion paper, the Province is seeking feedback on:

- The engagement approach and methods to seek participation in the future;
- Responses to a questionnaire around ten proposed outcomes and opportunities;
- Issues or concerns; and,
- Ideas or solutions that could be implemented, including how the fund should be invested.

Staff from the relevant divisions were involved in drafting responses to the questions posed in the discussion paper, included in Attachment A. The learnings from the recently completed Watershed Service Feasibility Study were considered while drafting responses.

Organizational and intergovernmental implications

Staff were not able to consult other governing authorities while drafting an SCRD response to the discussion paper based on timing and capacity. Staff are aware that the Town of Gibsons will also submit a response. Staff will share the SCRD response with staff from the governing authorities involved in the Watershed Service Feasibility Study.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications related to this submission.

Timeline for next steps

The Province will use the feedback received through this engagement to help develop options for the proposed Watershed Security Strategy and Fund. The Province will release a draft Watershed Security Strategy for a second period of engagement in Fall 2022, and anticipates launching the Watershed Security Strategy and Fund in Spring 2023.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

Within the SCRD Board's 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, this submission responds to an advocacy action to pursue watershed governance opportunities for improved protection of watersheds.

CONCLUSION

On January 25, 2022, the Provincial Government invited comments on a discussion paper titled, "Watershed Security Strategy and Fund". Staff coordinated the development of a response, included in Attachment A. Staff are seeking direction to submit this feedback before the March 18, 2022 deadline.

Attachment

Attachment A – SCRD Response to the Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper

Reference

BC Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper Webpage https://engage.gov.bc.ca/watershedsecurity

Reviewed by:						
Manager		Finance				
GM	X – I. Hall	Legislative				
CAO	X – D. McKinley	Other				

55

Attachment A

Sunshine Coast Regional District

1975 Field Road Sechelt, British Columbia Canada V7Z 0A8 P 604-885-6800 F 604-885-7909 Toll free 1-800-687-5753

info@scrd.ca www.scrd.ca



March 10, 2022

Water Protection and Sustainability Branch Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy PO Box 9362 STN PROV GOVT Victoria BC V8W 9M2

Re: SCRD Response to the Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper

Background

Drinking water supply and water conservation are a priority for the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD). However, the SCRD has a limited mandate and resources to protect the natural and cultural values of watersheds across the region. The SCRD's focus is on water protection activities at its drinking water sources.

Threats to Local Watersheds

The SCRD is aware of the need for and importance of watershed security. Our community, the services we provide, and surrounding aquatic ecosystems are influenced by impacts to local watersheds. We are observing climate change first-hand, with less precipitation than projected nine out of last 13 summers. This has resulted in the recurring need to activate the most stringent water restrictions in BC. Our community is also affected by the increased intensity of precipitation events, that in 2021 caused serious flooding and landslides, disrupting our water distribution system for thousands of people and undermining the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure's ability to manage rural roads and Highway 101, the single transportation corridor for most of the Sunshine Coast.

SCRD's Current Watershed Protection Activities

The SCRD undertakes several programs and activities to protect its drinking water sources and areas that are impacted by residential and commercial development, including:

- Regular but limited water quality testing in drinking watersheds,
- Aligning planning regulations and policies with the *BC Riparian Areas Protection Regulation* to protect habitat,
- Providing input on the BC Timber Sales (BCTS) 5-year Operating Plan each year, and other related engagement opportunities as they arise, to which the SCRD has not supported logging in drinking watersheds, both surface and groundwater sources, and has sought to avoid any risk to drinking water quality,
- Delivering community outreach and education programs, primarily related to water supply and conservation; and,
- Offering rebate programs for water saving devices, such as rainwater harvesting barrels.

56

- In addition, the SCRD has emerging initiatives that aim to better protect watersheds, including:
 Last year, SCRD explored its mandate for protecting watersheds, specifically different activities that could be pursued under its existing regional district services that focus on watersheds used for drinking water, planning and regulations; and,
 - This year, staff are developing a drinking water management plan and a climate emergency action plan that will aim to provide long-term direction to the SCRD's services, infrastructure investments and programs.

Collaborating with First Nations

The SCRD recognizes that the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw have been stewards of the land on which the SCRD operates since time immemorial, and that watershed protection could play a role in reconciliation at the local and regional level. Under the Constitution of Canada, First Nations and the Province are responsible for broader land-use planning, including watersheds. In addition, the BC *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* outlines that free and informed consent will become a requirement prior to the approval of any project affecting First Nation lands or territories and other resources, including water.

Limitations to SCRD's Authority and Resources

While the SCRD is supportive of the proposed strategy outlined in the BC Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper, we want to emphasize that Local Governments like ourselves do not have sufficient resources to respond to increasing watershed insecurity in our region, specifically to protect current and future drinking water sources, let alone other watersheds values, such as ecological and cultural values. In our attached response to the discussion paper, we outlined initiatives the Province could take to advance watershed security at the local level, such as empower and support local parties to participate more effectively in watershed security efforts, apply and expand tools in the BC *Water Sustainability Act*, increase watershed monitoring, and develop and implement mechanisms to manage cumulative impacts.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this engagement. We look forward to learning more about the next steps for developing a Watershed Security Strategy and Fund. Please note that the SCRD is prepared to engage with the Province and local First Nations on the development of any watershed security pilot projects.

For more information or questions you may have, please contact Remko Rosenboom, General Manager Infrastructure Services, at <u>Remko.Rosenboom@scrd.ca</u>.

Yours truly,

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

Darnelda Siegers Chair, SCRD Board of Directors

Enclosures: SCRD Responses to the Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper Questionnaire

SCRD Response to the Watershed Security Strategy and Fund Discussion Paper

Link to the engagement page <u>https://feedback.engage.gov.bc.ca/188318?lang=en</u> Link to the discussion paper <u>https://engage.gov.bc.ca/app/uploads/sites/722/2022/01/Watershed-Security-Strategy-Discussion-</u> Paper 04.pdf

Introduction

What do we mean by watershed security?

Watershed security implies the availability of good quality water for healthy ecosystems and communities. Watershed security will look different from watershed to watershed, and so will best be defined locally. Some elements of watershed security may include:

- Safe drinking water for all,
- Healthy and resilient aquatic, riparian, wetland, and watershed ecosystems,
- Sufficient water to support food security, recreation, jobs, and local economies,
- Sufficient water for First Nations, and
- Reduced risks from water related hazards such as flooding and drought.

Do you agree with this definition of watershed security?

Yes, we agree with this definition of watershed security.

Outcome One: Support and enable watershed governance.

What could the Province provide to better enable watershed governance initiatives?

The Province could undertake the following initiatives to advance watershed security at the local level:

- 1) Empower and enable local parties to participate more effectively in watershed security efforts by clarifying their roles and responsibilities, and actively supporting local parties with resources to protect and restore the integrity of watersheds.
- 2) Initiate a coordinated and province-wide implementation using the existing tools within the BC Water Sustainability Act to improve the incorporation of watershed values in land-use planning and modernize land development legislation accordingly, like those related to forestry and new subdivisions. Given the current state and trends of watersheds, and to effectively guarantee long-term water security, these tools should be based on the precautionary principle.
- Facilitate local parties to engage in the monitoring of trends and pressures on the security of watersheds and aquifers, including in the context of climate change and impacts on ecosystems, drinking water supply and food security.
- 4) Develop and implement mechanisms to assess and manage cumulative impacts to watersheds at a local level, including watersheds used for drinking water.

How can the Province facilitate and support government-to-government arrangements that help improve watershed health and security and advance reconciliation?

The SCRD recognizes that the shíshálh Nation and the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw have work underway with the Province related to land-use planning, including watershed governance.

The SCRD is currently legally limited in our participation in watershed governance, beyond work related to watersheds used for drinking or implementation of the *BC Riparian Areas Protection Regulation*. Recognizing the importance of watershed health and security, the SCRD recently concluded a feasibility study for the establishment of a new service that would allow for work to be undertaken in other watersheds or focused on other watershed values. The study concluded that currently there is not sufficient support within the community and amongst other governing authorities required to establish such a service. That said, the SCRD is very committed to advancing reconciliation with the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, including themes like land-use planning and watershed security.

In order for the SCRD to participate in watershed governance more fully with local First Nations, the SCRD would need to be empowered and enabled by the Province to do so. The Province would need to clarify its roles and responsibilities and actively provide supporting resources, while the SCRD may need to establish a dedicated watershed service.

How can watershed governance protect provincial, regional, Indigenous, and local values?

Watershed governance would include both convening and regulatory components that orients all activities and actors in watersheds to the same responsibilities, geared toward protecting and restoring the integrity of watersheds, while reconciling relationships with First Nations.

- SCRD is responsible for the provision of drinking water to the community through its three water services. The SCRD is interested in protecting current and future water supplies, including any water supplies impacted by upstream watershed activities. Generally activities in a watershed are not the SCRD's authority.
- On the Sunshine Coast, private property, community gathering places, and significant aquatic habitat (streams, lakes, wetlands and foreshore) are downstream of steep topography and significant industrial impacts to upland portions of local watersheds. Watershed governance, if oriented to protect the restoration of watershed integrity, could better protect significant downstream values (e.g., habitat, property values, gathering places, cultural heritage) that are integral to maintaining a healthy, resilient community in the face of climate change.

Outcome Two: Enhance our understanding of watersheds and the risks they face.

What does your organization, government or community need to be successful to access, collect, and share water data?

The SCRD is aware that the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw are actively monitoring watersheds. The SCRD is also aware that the local Streamkeepers group monitors particular watersheds in the region.

The SCRD has several methods of collecting continuous water quality data at drinking water sources, and this information could be shared more openly with other organizations. The SCRD would be interested in the opportunity to add data to a provincial database, but recognize certain data collection criteria would need to be met.

To share water data, it would be important to share monitoring protocols. The method of data collection will need to be disclosed with any data that is being shared, including equipment type and sources of error. The Province should consider data and information collected through Indigenous Traditional Knowledge.

A citizen science spatial data opportunity could also strengthen the capacity of local, regional, and provincial data on which to monitor impacts and make decisions. The <u>Howe Sound Marine</u> <u>Reference Guide</u> is a model example that could be replicated and expanded to include other nearby areas and with a focus on upland aquatic ecosystems.

Do you use watershed characterizations to help understand the status, drivers, and stressors in your watershed? If so, what do you use watershed characterizations to understand (e.g., land use pressures, climate and climate change, status of fish and aquatic health, etc.)?

No. The SCRD monitors water quality of drinking water sources to meet drinking water quality standards.

If the SCRD had sufficient funding, the SCRD would use watershed characterizations to better understand the following, but not limited to:

- Water availability for drinking water supplies, including surface water and groundwater
- Climate change impacts
- Saltwater intrusion and contamination
- Status and risks to drinking watersheds

Depending on changes to the SCRD's mandate and if there was added value for other authorities or organizations, for example local First Nations, the scope above could be expanded, for example, to include land use pressures and ecosystem values.

Outcome Three: Progress reconciliation with Indigenous peoples using new and improved mechanisms for collaboration on provincial water priorities.

What would be helpful for your organization to better understand the Province's obligations to Indigenous peoples for water policy development (e.g., written materials, webinars, videos)?

In general terms, the SCRD has a good understanding of the Province's obligations to Indigenous peoples for water policy development, and would like more insight into how the Province is implementing these obligations, including with respect to the role of the SCRD as the provider of water to indigenous peoples.

More information about Provincial initiatives and implementation could be provided through written materials and webinars. In addition, the broader public may benefit from more communication from the Province about their obligations to Indigenous peoples for water policy development.

60

Outcome Four: Achieve healthy water for everyone

Which principles do you think should underlie source water protection?

The following are principles that should underlie source water protection:

- Protection of public health
- Protection and enhancement of natural processes impacting water quality and natural hydrological processes
- Habitat and ecosystem services protection
- Potential for reduced treatment or costs
- Potential for meeting community drinking water demand
- Improved long-term management of critical natural assets
- Improved preparedness and response capacity for emergency events

How can communities, all levels of government (local, provincial, federal and First Nation), as well as industrial water users work together better to protect drinking water for human health and wellbeing, for now and in the future?

- See answers around water governance (Outcome 1).
- Adequately protect the water rights obtained under active Water Licences, including from upstream development.
- Increase watershed and aquifer monitoring, and groundwater mapping.
- Plan infrastructure improvements to withstand increased 100-yr flood events (i.e bridges, dams and culverts) and impacts to water quality (higher turbidity and TSS).

In addition, we know that the local First Nations and the Province have land-use planning processes underway and the SCRD is planning to update its Official Community Plan and has start doing work to support the development of a Regional growth Strategy. The protection of watershed values could play a role in these processes.

Outcome Five: Integrate water more efficiently and effectively into Land Use Planning.

What do you value most about your watershed (e.g., water for drinking, water for aquatic species, water for recreation, water for business, wild food harvesting, etc.)? Are any of these values threatened by development in your watershed? If so, how could the Watershed Security Strategy help people in your watershed protect those values?

As a local government and water purveyor, safe, clean drinking water is a primary value for both surface and groundwater sources, now and in the future. SCRD Official Community Plans, Regional Sustainability Plan, and Agricultural Area Plan speak to the community's strong desire to protect values of the Sunshine Coast, such as riparian and shoreline areas, aquifers, wildlife corridors, parks, trail and recreation corridors, community heritage and gathering places and agricultural areas. Given the topography of the Sunshine Coast most of these values are at risk of being impacted by development in upland watersheds, including forestry and mining activities conducted on provincially-owned land over which the SCRD has little influence.

The Watershed Security Strategy could support the implementation of existing tools in the *BC Water Sustainability Act* that could help improve the incorporation of these watershed values in land-use planning. The Watershed Security Strategy could also guide upgrades to these tools and modernize land development legislation and regulations, including those related to forestry and new subdivisions.

What is the best way to communicate information about WSA tools with you (e.g., written materials, webinars, videos, etc.)?

Written materials, webinars, videos, email listservs. Articles in the local newspapers are also a good way to reach many Sunshine Coast citizens.

How do you think that water should be considered in land use planning?

When considering water and land-use planning, it would be important to focus on addressing or preventing conflict, mitigating risk to water quality, water quantity (incl ecosystem requirements and stormwater), and aquatic ecosystem health, and to do this work in the context of the current state of watersheds and the impacts of climate change.

Outcome Six: Reset the water supply and demand relationship.

What can water users in your watershed do to reduce the amount of water they use?

Over the past decade, the SCRD has experienced long, hot summers, and extended drought. This has resulted in the recurring need to activate the most stringent water restrictions in BC, which at the highest stage (Stage 4) bans outdoor water use. The SCRD is urgently working on increasing water supplies.

To promote water conservation, water users need to be aware of their water use. By early 2023, the SCRD will have a fully implemented water meter program. The SCRD shares data with water users who are subscribed to monthly water use updates and sends notifications to users with ongoing leaks. The SCRD also has a rainwater harvesting rebate program to encourage use of non-potable water during the summer months. The SCRD is currently developing a Water Efficiency Plan to further expand its water conservation program. The SCRD is collaborating with the District of Sechelt to confirm the feasibility of the reuse of their water treatment plan effluent water to offset the use of treated water.

How could the Watershed Security Strategy help implement these solutions?

Increasing knowledge about the value of water and watershed literacy directly supports water conservation.

Outcome Seven: Improve habitats for aquatic ecosystems.

In your opinion, what actions would best support the restoration, rehabilitation and improvement of water and aquatic habitats in your local watershed? Please provide more details on your answers and include examples where possible (e.g., if you included "provide training", please discuss what support for this would look like and the types of training or subject areas that would be most useful.)

The SCRD is currently legally limited in how it participates in any watershed governance work other than work related to its drinking watersheds or to the implementation of the *BC Riparian Area Protection Regulation* (see Outcome 1). Any work on this topic should be guided through discussions with the local First Nations and the Provincial Government.

Beneficial actions could include:

- Proactive watershed level land-use planning frameworks that orient to protection, restoration of watersheds.
- Watershed monitoring and data collection to inform proactive planning and cumulative effects mitigation.
- Cumulative effects analysis tools and mitigation frameworks that are updated to reflect climate change impacts and local context.
- The above should involve holding all stakeholders (public, private) to the same minimum standards.

Outcome Eight: Respect the integrity of Indigenous Knowledge systems.

What do you or your organization need to foster respectful sharing and consideration of science and Indigenous Knowledge within your organization?

SCRD needs to and will continue doing our own work and on the ground relationship-building with the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw.

Outcome Nine: Strengthen education and outreach about managing water in B.C.

What is the best method for you, your community or organization to receive and share information?

For the community, newspaper advertisements, direct mail campaigns, Facebook, online workshops, informational highway, water body, and park signage.

Please list what additional watershed knowledge and/or tools would be most useful to you

The following additional watershed knowledge would be useful:

- Clarity on jurisdictional responsibility.
- Universal watershed literacy materials that could be shared on our website and within our communities. For example, what's a watershed, what's an aquifer, impacts of climate changes on watersheds, etc. Materials could be available like a library and easy to access.

Outcome Ten: Create a Watershed Security Fund.

How would you prioritize investments in watershed security if more funding is directed toward supporting a Watershed Security Strategy?

1. Increased integration of water in land-use and resource management, regulations, planning and decisions.

- 2. Increased watershed governance-oriented processes between First Nations, the Province, local governments, resource industry and NGOs at the watershed level.
- 3. Improved monitoring and analyses of watersheds and aquifers to better understand their current states, pressures and trends to support decision-making and long-term planning.

What do you see as the main benefit(s) British Columbians would obtain through government investment in watershed security?

The community would benefit from:

- Safe and sufficient drinking water.
- Healthy and resilient watershed ecosystems.
- Sufficient water to support local values like recreation, cultural services, food security and local economy.
- Reduced risks from water related hazards such as drought and flooding.

What opportunities and priorities do you think a Watershed Security Fund could focus on?

The following is a list of opportunities and priorities the Watershed Security Fund could focus on:

- Support First Nations to build additional capacity for their current or new land-use planning and watershed management work.
- Support participation of local governments in watershed management initiatives led by local First Nations and the Province.
- Supporting water providers (incl. local governments) in their efforts to ensure a climate change resilient water supply to their communities (long-term planning, source protection, water conservation and increasing supply).
- Improving monitoring and assessments of watersheds and aquifers health, including by local parties within a provincial framework.
- Supporting the local parties (incl. First Nations and Local Governments) to implement current and new regulatory tools to enhance the integration of water security values in land-use decision making.
- Support ecosystem rehabilitation projects initiated by local parties (incl. NGO's and First Nations).
- Water balance studies for watersheds and aquifers used for drinking water supply.
- Projects to increase the community understanding and consideration in local government decision-making of cultural values of watersheds and aquifers.
- Making resources and funds available for the agricultural sector to conserve water, reduce reliance of potable drinking water and impacts on local watersheds.

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Remko Rosenboom, General Manager, Infrastructure Services

SUBJECT: SCRD'S APPROACH TO ARCHAEOLOGY ASSESSMENTS

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled SCRD's Approach to Archaeology Assessments be received for information;

AND THAT the SCRD apply for a Multi-Use Assessment Permit under the *Heritage Conservation Act* for all common ground disturbing work undertaken by the SCRD within the shíshálh Nation swiya and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw traditional territory Te'mexw Treaty Association, Hul'qumi'num Nations, Snuneymuxw Territory, səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), xwməθkwəỷəm (Musqueam Nation);

AND FURTHER THAT staff update communication materials that pertain to archaeology assessments by Q3 2022.

BACKGROUND

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) recognizes that the shishalh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, Te'mexw Treaty Association, Hul'gumi'num Nations, Snuneymuxw Territory, səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), x^wməθk^wəyəm (Musqueam Nation) have occupied and used the land within the regional district boundary for thousands of years. Heritage sites found throughout First Nations territory are an important historical and cultural connection to the land. Further, prior to 1800s, First Nations had occupied, utilized, and managed every inch of this beautiful coastline. It is extremely difficult to develop accurate population estimates of the First Nation societies prior to 1800s without intensive archaeological demographic studies; however, the archaeology to date evidences the existence of socially and economically complex societies comprised of a myriad of large and dense villages. The population of First Nations people on the Sunshine Coast in the early 1800s could have been only a fraction smaller than today's regional population, and its important to note that this the was a society already suffering the effects of diseases causing population decline in the 1800s. Diseases like smallpox, tuberculosis, scarlet fever, influenza and measles reduced this population to only a couple of hundred at its lowest in the 1860s. Given that initial population and the deep antiquity of First Nation occupation of the Coast, it is apparent that First Nations and archaeologists have identified and preserved dozens of archaeological sites during SCRD projects, particularly since the SCRD incorporated preconstruction archaeological assessments. Excavations conducted by both the SCRD and the public have the potential to disturb an archaeological site any time the ground is disturbed during construction activity, including during the installation or repair of water infrastructure, or during development of land or park areas. Many, many more archaeological sites on the Coast have not been yet identified and have yet to be "discovered" by archaeologists.

In British Columbia (BC), archaeological sites are protected under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act, 1996* (HCA), including sites that are known or not yet identified. Archaeological sites must not be altered without a permit from the BC Archaeology Branch of the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource and Rural Development and in consultation with affected First Nations,

depending on the location, as per their respective heritage policies (see Attachments B and C). Archaeological sites and cultural artifacts can be, but are not limited to; remains, sacred and spiritual places, house and village sites, tools, culturally modified trees, art, and other managed landscapes. Under the HCA, the entity (person/organisation) actually impacting a site or causing it to be impacted is liable for doing so. Meaning, the SCRD is liable for any impacts it causes to a site during its own projects, regardless if staff or a contractor is undertaking the actual excavation work. It is not appropriate (and can cause adverse impacts) to discuss the details of artifacts, specific finds or locations, as these are culturally important materials to the shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nations. However, sites have been identified and recorded all over the Coast during SCRD projects while, for example, hundreds of artifacts have been recovered during hand digging for the installation of water meters, and machine excavations for watermain installations or water and wastewater service connections. These sites would not have been discovered, and the SCRD would have been in contravention of the HCA (1996), without archaeologists/First Nations on site to monitor these developments with the appropriate permits.

The SCRD began discussions with the shíshálh Nation about archaeological assessments in 2005, and held meetings to discuss the development of the *Protocol Agreement on Heritage*, signed by both parties in 2006. The purpose of the agreement is to ensure the protection of heritage sites as per the HCA and within the SCRD's authority under the *Local Government Act*, while also promoting respect and raising awareness about heritage properties. The SCRD met with the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw in 2015, to explore developing a similar agreement that included reference to culture and heritage protection, however, no agreement was signed.

The SCRD began project-related archaeological assessment work late in the year 2000. Referrals to an archaeologist were requested on an ad-hoc basis, and typically only when work occurred within an existing archaeological site or sometimes for new large-scale projects, for example, the Chapman Water Treatment Plant. In 2016, the Utility Services Division formalized the preconstruction assessment process through a Section 12.2 Multi-Assessment Permit (MAP), issued under the HCA and formerly called a Section 14 Blanket Permit. A MAP authorises multiple assessments within a defined specific geographic area and using consistent archaeological methods. The SCRD's current MAP applies to water infrastructure operations, and includes both shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nation lands, who each provided input on the scope and methods for the current MAP, and are consulted on assessments within their territory. With the MAP in place, there is no need to seek a new permit from the BC Archaeology Branch for each routine assessment, and the process in place ensures that appropriate policies are being applied and that consultation with affected First Nations is meaningful and ongoing.

There is also a difference in the information considered between the MAP process and that of Provincial Archology Branch. The MAP process is more comprehensive and current than the minimal information requirements under the HCA. For example, there is a 5-6-year backlog of newly identified sites to the database of archeological sites the Archeology Brach is managing and that database is based on archeological surveys with a limited scope. Besides, the HCA only consider artifacts from before 1846 and does not consider oral histories, ethnographic data, and any other information in unique possession of the First Nation. By acquiring the MAP and building on established relationships working with local First Nations, we ensure these and other information are considered during risk management decisions. This, in turn, reduces the risk that a known or an unknown archeological site would be impacted by development without the proper permits (which is a violation of the HCA).

Note that Archaeological Impact Assessments and projects that involve alterations to a site with artifacts (known or unknown) require separate permits under the HCA. There are two Heritage Permits issued by the province; i) A section 12.2 permit facilitates an Archaeological Impact

66

Staff Report to Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022 SCRD's Approach to Archaeology Assessments

Assessment (AIA) to investigate whether a site exists (this includes MAPs), and ii) a Section 12.4, Site Alteration Permit (SAP) authorizes the alteration of a site and must be acquired prior to any development/excavations within a site boundary. Under the MAP process the need for a SAP permit is often identified in the pre-construction phase reducing damage to the archaeology, reducing liability, and reducing impacts to project schedules. Obtaining permits at the very early stage of planning will limit the potential for project related delays, as permits may take months to acquire from the Province.

The SCRD's current MAP is set to expire on June 30, 2022.

With the upcoming renewal of the MAP, the purpose of this report is to review the current process and seek direction on next steps for archaeological work related to the SCRD's operations.

DISCUSSION

Context for Decision Making

The relationship between the SCRD and the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw has and is held in the highest of esteem. The SCRD has prioritized working together and reconciliation in its 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, and while the SCRD has made efforts to date to work and collaborate with local First Nations, what is needed to work towards reconciliation with Indigenous peoples today requires more from the SCRD than has previously been offered. Legislation like the *BC Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* (DRIPA) is now in place, which requires the Province take all measures necessary to ensure consistency between the UN Declaration and the laws of British Columbia including the Local Government Act. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action number 43, calls for all governments to adopt and implement UNDRIP as the framework for reconciliation. As such, further advancing the relationship is important for the SCRD and the entire Sunshine Coast community. Respecting the expectations of the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw on how to protect their heritage should be considered an essential part of advancing our relationships with both Nations.

Current approach

The current MAP only includes SCRD water works projects. In 2021, 63 projects were assessed, some of which were one-day projects (e.g. the installation of a water meter), while others were more substantial multi-week projects (e.g. the replacement of a watermain). This confirms that most days the Utility Services Division has work underway that could disturb an archaeological site. The current process allows the SCRD to work closely with an archaeologist and First Nations to reduce the risk of disturbing a potential archaeological site during these projects without appropriate pre-work assessments and consultation. Under the current MAP, an archaeologist completes an initial assessment for each site where ground disturbance is planned and determines the archaeological potential and what kind of further assessments are required, if any, to remain in compliance with the HCA. The associated costs can vary depending on if site assessments are required before or during the completion of any work, the location and the available data. In most instances the SCRD fund any archeological work required related to operation and maintenance. If the SCRD is installing water or wastewater services in support of land development the costs for archeological assessments, and any other costs associated with the installation of that infrastructure improvement, are charged to the developer.

67

Benefits of a MAP

The MAP process significantly reduces the risk of impacting the heritage of our local First Nations and of enforcement actions under the HCA. The MAP significantly reduces the potential processing time for permits for individual construction projects planned by the SCRD, including emergency construction works, resulting in more predictable construction timelines. The MAP process also helps the SCRD to align with shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nation heritage policies.

Without a MAP, the SCRD would need to seek individual permits for each and every work project it undertakes that could impact the heritage of the local First Nations. Those permits would need to be obtained from the Archeology Branch. If the SCRD wants to adhere to the heritage policies of the shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, separate permits would need to be obtained as well from them. The permit application process with the Archeology Branch and both local First Nations can take several months to complete, which would significantly impact the SCRD's ability to undertake any ground disturbing work in a timely manner. While not adhering to the Heritage Policies from the local First Nations would result in fewer archeological assessments being completed for projects and a reduced overall cost related to archeological assessments, the MAP process significantly reduced the risk for substantial costs associated with project delays and shut downs, fines and other penalties under the HCA, and costs to rectify archaeological sites.

SCRD staff consider the MAP process a success because it allows for predictability in construction timelines, avoids emergency situations, enhanced communication, cooperation, and SCRD staff are increasingly considering archeological assessments as common as undertaking an environmental assessment.

The current MAP only includes water infrastructure projects. However, the SCRD carries out work in other divisions, including the Parks division, where ground may also be disturbed. Therefore, staff wish to expand the scope of the new permit to include additional types of activities.

Staff recommendation

Staff recommend initiating the application process for a MAP with a scope to all common ground disturbing activities by all SCRD departments. To support this work, staff will review relevant bylaws and policies, or develop additional policies if required.

Simultaneously, staff will update the SCRD website and hard-copy information related to archeological assessments.

Organizational and interagency implications

Expanding the MAP process to include additional considerations for ground disturbance work within the SCRD, for example, Parks Division works and projects, would expand the efficiencies and benefits that are now just experienced in water projects. There would be no impact to the water system work by the Utility Services Division, who are already covered under the current MAP.

Using a collaborative approach to archaeological assessments presents an opportunity for the SCRD to support relationships and reconciliation objectives with the shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nations. Increasing the Sunshine Coast community's understanding of the importance of heritage sites, and the connection for First Nations people to their history and culture, is also important for further advancing this relationship. Additionally, the protection of heritage sites is the law in British

68

Columbia and there is an operational benefit of introducing archaeological assessments early in the process.

Financial Implications

All base operating budgets for service operations where ground disturbance is required includes funds for archeological assessments and is expected to be sufficient to cover the costs associated with archeological assessments in 2022. However, the actual annual costs of these assessments depend on the number and complexity of projects and assessments required.

Timeline for next steps

If the Board supports the recommendation, the SCRD arrange for the required documents being submitted with the BC Archaeology Branch in early April 2022.

Communications Strategy

Staff identified several opportunities to improve the SCRD's public-facing information regarding its approach towards archeology throughout the organization. To increase public (incl. developers) awareness and understanding about the SCRD's process for archaeological assessments, staff will update application forms, create new outreach materials and a new webpage. The SCRD will also provide links to shíshálh Nation and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw resources and policies.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This project responds to an important strategy in the SCRD Board's 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, 3.1 Enhance First Nations Relations and Reconciliation, including an action to enhance corporate and community knowledge and awareness of First Nations history and culture.

CONCLUSION

The SCRD within the shíshálh Nation swiya and Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw traditional territory Te'mexw Treaty Association, Hul'qumi'num Nations, Snuneymuxw Territory, səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh Nation), xwmə0kwəýəm (Musqueam Nation). Activities that disturb the ground, undertaken by the SCRD and residents, such as installing new water lines or development, can reveal important evidence and insights into these First Nations history, and connect First Nations people to their land and traditions. Archaeological sites are protected under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act, 1996* (HCA) and appropriate permits with the Province and First Nations are required.

In the context of DRIPA, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action number 43 and the SCRDs maintenance and development projects, the SCRD is responsible to ensure all these projects comply with Provincial Laws, in a manner that recognizes and affirms the Title and Rights of First Nations, meets and addresses their priorities and concerns regarding protection of cultural heritage resources, and respects their laws, policies and practices.

The first discussions with the shíshálh Nation about an archaeological process occurred in 2005, and the SCRD started completing archaeological assessments on an ad-hoc basis. In 2016, the SCRD began to formalize the pre-construction archaeological assessments through a sector-based permit issued by the BC Archaeology Branch, now called a Multi-Use Assessment Permit (MAP). The current SCRD MAP pertains to lands within both shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nation

69

territories, applies only to water infrastructure, and is set to expire on June 30, 2022. Multiple archaeological sites have been identified that are connected to SCRD infrastructure work.

Staff provided a recommendation to reapply for a new MAP and expand the scope to include all common ground disturbing activities, and review SCRD policies to align the process. The recommendation provides a collaborative approach to archaeological assessments to further the SCRD's relationships with the shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nations, and reconciliation efforts that the SCRD outlined in the 2019-2023 Board Strategic Plan. The financial resources for the recommendation are included within the current departmental base budgets and if approved, the SCRD would seek a new permit early April 2022. The SCRD will also increase public awareness about the SCRD's process for archaeological assessments, including updating application forms, creating new outreach materials and a new webpage.

Attachments

Attachment A - Protocol Agreement on Heritage Nov 16, 2006

Attachment B - shíshálh Nation Heritage Policy

Attachment C - Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Policy 2021

Reviewed by:						
Manager	X - S. Walkey	Finance				
_	X - M. Edbrooke					
GM	X - S. Gagnon	Legislative	X - S. Reid			
	X – I. Hall	-				
CAO	X – D. McKinley	Other				

7()
Attachment A

PROTOCOL AGREEMENT ON HERITAGE

THIS PROTOCOL AGREEMENT dated the 16th day of November, 2006.

BETWEEN: shíshálh NATION (Sechelt Indian Band) 5555 Highway 101 Sechelt, B.C. V0N 3A0

(hereinafter referred to as the "Nation")

AND: SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT, 1975 Field Road Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A1

(hereinafter referred to as the "SCRD")

And, hereinafter referred to collectively as "the Parties".

WHEREAS:

- The Parties have mutual respect for each other's mandates, policies, values and areas of jurisdiction for those parts of the SCRD that correspond with shishalh traditional territory;
- 2) The Parties recognize that while the Sechelt Indian Government District is a member of the SCRD, each have distinct authorities and responsibilities towards their members and residents and acknowledge that the interests of all persons living within each of the jurisdictions are best served by working together in a spirit of cooperation;
- The Parties acknowledge that settlement areas now within the boundaries of the SCRD are lands that form part of shishalh towns and villages;
- 4) The Parties acknowledge that areas within the boundaries of the SCRD contain both aboriginal and non-aboriginal heritage properties;
- 5) The Parties are committed to carrying out the vision of this Protocol Agreement in a respectful and timely manner.

NOW THEREFORE the Parties have entered into this Protocol Agreement with the intention and desire to ensure the protection of heritage sites as envisioned by the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* in a manner that respects the responsibilities and limits of the SCRD under the *Local Government Act*.

ARTICLE 1 - shishalh Heritage Properties

1.01 The Parties acknowledge that shishalh Territory contains many important Cultural Heritage Resources (CHR). Cultural Heritage Resources are defined as "Anything used by the shishalh Nation, physical or non-physical which was, is or may be used when inhabiting either the physical or non-physical worlds".

ARTICLE 2 – Sunshine Coast Regional District Heritage Properties

2.01 The Parties acknowledge that the area within the boundaries of the Sunshine Coast Regional District contains non-aboriginal heritage properties.

ARTICLE 3 – Protection of Heritage

- 3.01 The Parties commit to take steps to protect the heritage properties as envisioned under the *BC Heritage Conservation Act* in accordance with this Protocol Agreement, consistent with enabling provincial legislation and the *Local Government Act*.
- 3.02 The Parties agree to promote respect and enhance awareness of each others heritage.
- 3.03 Applications for funding related to the development of management plans for heritage facilities (i.e. museums, cultural centres, interpretive signs, art exhibits, etc) and the establishment of heritage facilities which may affect or present the heritage of either of the Parties will be submitted to the Parties for review and approval prior to the submission of an application or establishment of a facility.

ARTICLE 4 – Government to Government Relations

- 4.01 The Parties agree to hold at least four (4) government to government meetings per year or as required. The objectives of these will be to:
 - Review the progress of joint committees and/or advisory groups (if any);
 - Identify potential areas of conflict and work to resolve these issues;

- Identify potential joint initiatives relating to Heritage protection and awareness; and
- Share information and improve communication.
- 4.02 Representatives appointed by each of the Parties will alternate the Chair of the government to government meetings.
- 4.03 Each Party agrees to provide notice on matters that could impact the Heritage of the other Party in a manner consistent with enabling provincial legislation (the *Local Government Act* and the *Heritage Conservation Act*).
- 4.04 Each Party agrees to deliver and consider referrals in a timely manner, consistent with their responsibilities and limitations under relevant legislation.
- 4.05 If emergency issues arise which threaten either Party's heritage, the Chief Councilor of the shishalh Nation and the Chair of the SCRD will meet as soon as both Parties are able and deal with the emergency issue.

ARTICLE 5 – Dispute Resolution

- 5.01 Both Parties pledge to engage in a respectful and honest relationship to protect each other's heritage.
- 5.02 If and when a dispute arises representatives of the technical staff will meet and attempt to resolve the dispute.
- 5.03 If the dispute cannot be resolved at the technical level either Party may request that political leadership be involved in the dispute resolution.

ARTICLE 6 – Terms of the Agreement and Implementation Agreements

- 6.01 The Parties agree that the conditions under which this document has been prepared are continually changing.
- 6.02 The Parties agree that implementation agreements respecting referrals of development applications in the SCRD should be developed to implement Article 4.03 and Article 4.04.
- 6.03 Consequently this Protocol Agreement may require revision in the future. If either Party desires revisions to this Protocol Agreement, they must be agreed to in writing and adopted by the Council of the shishálh Nation and by the SCRD Board.

-

Page 4 of 4

6.03 If either Party wishes to terminate this Protocol they must notify the other Party in writing. The Protocol will be terminated ninety (90) days after the date of written notification.

EXECUTED this 16th day of November, 2006.

shishalh NATION (SECHELT INDIAN BAND)

Per: Chief Ston Lipon ente tant Chief Stan Dixon **Councillor Marita Paul-Franke** Councillor Garry Feschuk **Councillor Tom Paul**

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT

Per: 00 John Rees, Chair Garry Nohr, Director, Electoral Area A Director, Electoral Area B Barry Jahyk,) Vice Chair Donna Shugar, Director, Fown of Gibsons Director, Electoral Area D 00 Ed Steeves, Eewis. Director, District of Sechelt Director, Electoral Area E Stan Dixon. Lee Turnbull, Director, Sechelt Indian Government Director, Electoral Area F District

Attachment B



shíshálh Nation Heritage Policy

(<u>k'</u> úlhut-tsut ?elh kwiyás)

1.0 Forward

shíshálh swiya (world) comprises 515, 000 hectares stretching from xwésám (Roberts Creek) in the southeast to <u>x</u>eníchen in the north to <u>k</u>wé<u>k</u>wenis (Lang Bay) in the southwest (Figure 1). We the *shíshálh* have intensively occupied and utilized our entire territory since time immemorial; a result of this intensive occupation are the heritage properties (Appendix C) left behind by our ancestors.

shíshálh history is both extensive and complex. Our history stems from our occupation and use of *tems swiya* (our world). *tems swiya* includes both spiritual and material realms. Heritage properties located within our territory were used by our ancestors to navigate throughout *tems swiya*. They reflect our history and our land which are inseparable. They also document the continuity of occupation and intensive utilization of *tems swiya* by the *shíshálh* Nation since time immemorial.

The central principle of the *shishálh* Heritage Policy is that heritage properties (i.e. artifacts, spiritual sites, stories, names and traditions) belong to those who made them regardless of the world within which they live. It is the original owners of these properties, as well as their descendants who are best able to determine how these properties should be treated in the present and future.

Therefore it is the responsibility of the *shíshálh* to manage our history for our ancestors, descendants and our Nation, by doing so we ensure our future for generations to come.



Figure 1. Map of shishalh territory indicating location of major village sites.

2.0 Jurisdiction

Since time immemorial we the *shíshálh* People have a historical, cultural, social, spiritual, economic and political connection to our territory.

The graves of our ancestors document the truth, our roots go deep into the earth. Therefore we the *shishálh* Nation have the primary jurisdiction to manage, protect and preserve the history of the *shishálh* Nation throughout our entire territory through the protection of our heritage.

3.0 Objective

Management of *shíshálh* heritage must reflect *shíshálh* values for the purpose of preserving and protecting our heritage for the betterment of the *shíshálh* Nation, and to ensure that our traditions and way of life live on.

4.0 Development

For over two hundred years the needs of settlers and development have super-ceded the protection of *shíshálh* heritage, this has resulted in the destruction of our history. Such development continues today and threatens the existence of our heritage.

The necessity to protect our Heritage should be primary over the needs of external development. Therefore all land use within our territory must be planned so as to result in as little conflict as possible with *shíshálh* heritage. Mitigation and/or compensation is required where impacts to *shíshálh* heritage is unavoidable.

4.1 Enforcement and Protection

It is primarily the responsibility of the *shíshálh* Nation to enforce all protection measures relating to our heritage. Non-*shíshálh* (i.e. settler governments of all jurisdiction, private citizens and industry) also have a responsibility as guests within our territory to treat our heritage with respect and manage it according to the traditions of the *shíshálh*.

4.1.2 Site Specific Management

All management recommendations pertaining to *shishálh* heritage properties must be formulated according to the *shishálh* heritage policy. Developments which may impact upon *shishálh* heritage properties must be assessed on an individual case by case basis. However, we will not allow certain heritage properties to be impacted regardless of the needs of proponents. These heritage properties include but are not limited to:

- Graves of our ancestors
- Sacred and Spiritual Places
- House sites
- Battle areas
- Wood and stone fish traps
- Works of art

5.0 Curation and Preservation of Cultural Properties

All *shíshálh* heritage properties shall remain within *shíshálh* territory and will be stored in the *tems swiya* Museum where they will be held in trust for their owners.

Heritage properties being loaned to non-*shíshálh* parties or leaving the territory to facilitate scientific study or artistic display may only leave the territory by the authority of the *shíshálh* Nation as expressed through Council Resolution and *tems swiya* Museum policy.

All *shíshálh* Heritage properties which have been removed from the territory for any purpose without the consent of the *shíshálh* Nation must be repatriated to the *shíshálh* Nation immediately where they will be held in trust at the *tems swiya* Museum until the rightful owner is identified.

6.0 Heritage Investigations

The *shishalh* Nation requires that all forestry developments which may include but not necessarily limited to: (1) timber harvesting blocks, (2) roads, (3) landings, (4) sorts, (5) dumps, and (6) heli-drops be subject to preliminary field reconnaissance (PFR). The PFR must be conducted by an archaeologist and a member of the *shishalh* Nation. The PFR should also be conducted under permit to allow for a more detailed archaeological impact assessment (AIA) if it is determined that and AIA is required.

All residential and commercial developments and private moorages must also be subject to a PFR prior to the initiation of land-altering activities. The results and recommendations of the PFR must be presented in a "interim archaeological report" which must be provided to the *shishalh* Nation within five working days of completion of the fieldwork.

All archaeological investigations conducted within *shíshálh* territory excluding PFR's must be conducted under a *shíshálh* Nation Heritage Investigation Permit (see Appendix A and B) as well as any other permits deemed necessary by settler governments. *shíshálh* permits will only be issued once all the conditions of a *shíshálh* Heritage Investigation permit application have been met to the satisfaction of the *shíshálh* Nation.

shíshálh Nation requires that impacts to *shíshálh* heritage properties be considered, assessed, and mitigated from all development-related disturbances and impacts.

shíshálh Nation recognizes seven types of heritage investigations; (1) preliminary field reconnaissance (no permit required), (2) archaeological impact assessments, (3) archaeological inventory, (4) mitigative excavation, (5) archaeological monitoring (6) traditional use assessment and (7) scientific investigation. Archaeological overview assessments are not recognized by the *shishalh* Nation.

6.1 Requirements of Heritage Investigators

All persons conducting investigations into any aspect of *shíshálh* Heritage must obtain a *shíshálh* Nation Heritage Investigation Permit prior to the initiation of the study. Heritage investigations must be conducted according to the terms and conditions of the *shíshálh* Nation as defined by the *shíshálh* Nation Heritage Investigation Permit. The application

for a *shishalh* Nation Heritage Investigation Permit can be obtained from the *shishalh* Rights and Title Department (604.885-2273 or email: <u>arc@secheltnation.net</u>). A \$300.00 application fee is levied on all permit applications.

6.1.1 Heritage Investigation Terms and Conditions

- 1. This Heritage Investigation Permit is valid for the period indicated. The duration of the permit may be extended for a specific period by the *shishálh* Nation upon receipt from the permit-holder of a written application for an extension.
- 2. The permit-holder shall provide the *shíshálh* Nation with two (2) bound copies and one digital copy of a written report, in accordance with the standards established and maintained by Archaeology Planning and Assessment of the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management.
- 3. A person designated by the *shishálh* Nation may at any time inspect a project being conducted under the terms and conditions of the permit, including projects, records and materials recovered under authority of the permit.
- 4. Upon completion of any inspection or investigation involving excavations, the permitholder shall make reasonable efforts to ensure all sites are restored as nearly as practicle to their former condition.
- All cultural materials recovered during the course of the study shall be deposited prior to the expiry of the permit to the *shíshálh* Nation *tems swiya* Museum (P.O. Box 740, Sechelt B.C. VON 3AO) by the permit holder.
- 6. The permit-holder must be present "on site" for at least 80% of all fieldwork undertaken under this Permit.
- 7. In the event that human remains are identified during the course of the study covered under this permit, the permit holder must contact the *shíshálh* Nation immediately and must not disturb the remains unless or until authorized by the *shíshálh* Nation.
- 8. A member of the *shíshálh* Nation Rights and Title Department will be retained as an assistant during the duration of the fieldwork component of the study.
- 9. Prior to the completion of the written report the permit-holder must contact the *shíshálh* Nation regarding the "ethnic significance" (see British Columbia Archaeological Impact Assessment Guidelines, Section 3.5.2.2) of any heritage materials found.
- 10. The *shíshálh* Nation be given the opportunity to review and comment on the recommendations of the subsequent permit report prior to report finalization.
- 11. The permit holder will supply the *shíshálh* Nation with a copy of the final permit report in both digital (pdf) and hard copy formats.

Appendix A. Shishain Hadion Hendage investigation i ennit application.	Appendix A.	shíshálh Nation Heritage Investigation Permit application.
------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	------------------------------------------------------------

			App No. RAT No.	0 5 SNR05
			ARC No. Fee Paid	SNA \$
				*
	shíshálh Nation F	tights and Title	Departmen	it - Archaeology
	5555 Highway 101, P.O. Tel: 604.885.2274/Toll H	Box 740 Sechelt, B.C Free: 1.866.885.2275/F	. VON-3AO ax: 604.885.34	90
shishál	h Nation Heritag	e Investigation	Permit Δ	pplication
Snishai	(Seci	helt Indian Band))	pheaton
A 11 1		dla Matian (Cashalt In	dian Dand) tami	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
involving shíshálh Natio	on Heritage properties as	defined by the shishalk	Nation Heritag	ge Policy must be condu
under a :	<i>inishalh</i> Nation Heritage I	investigation Permit is:	sued by the shis	shain Nation.
	Section 1.0	Applicant info	rmation	
Applicant/Archaeolog	st in charge:			
Agoncy Affiliation:				
Agency Annation:				
Office Address:				
Telephone No:		Fa	nx No:	
Email address:				
	Section 2.0	Project Area De	ecription	
		Floject Alea De	semption	
Borden Number and g	eneral site type:			
Legal Description:				
PID:		PIN:		
General Location:				
NTS map sheet:				

Тур	pe of Invest	tigation:	PFR()	Inventory () AIA	()	Monitor	ring ()
			Mitigative e	xcavation ()	Oth	er (describe)	
Pro	ponent:							
Esti	imated dui	ation of pro	ject (field and	report preparation):			
Reg	rin•		J (/-			
End	1:							
Nu	mbor of sh	íchálh accist	ants required:					
Inui	mber of sm	snuin assist	ants required.					
		Section	4.0 Info	rmation to be S	ubmittee	l with Ap	plication	
		Section	4.0 Info	rmation to be S	ubmittee	l with Ap	plication	l
	Provi	Section	4.0 Info	rmation to be S applications sub	ubmitteo nitted for	1 with Ap	plication	l
	Provid	Section de copies o	4.0 Info	rmation to be S applications sub-	ubmitted	d with Ap this inves	plication	ts issued fo
	Provid Identi invest	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation.	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for gagency	d with Ap this investor for any othe	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
Per	Provie Identi invest mit No.	Section de copies (fy permit/ igation. Issui	.4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency:	rmation to be S applications sub ver(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for gagency	d with Ap this invest for any oth	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
2. Per	Provia Identi invest mit No.	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issui	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency:	rmation to be S applications sub per(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for gagency	d with Ap this investor for any oth	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
Per	Provia Identi invest mit No.	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issu	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency:	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for gagency	d with Ap this invest for any oth	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
Per	Provid Identi invest mit No.	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issui	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency:	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for gagency	d with Ap this invest for any ot	plication tigation ner permit	ts issued fo
Peri	Provia Identi invest mit No.	Section de copies (fy permit/ igation. Issue	4.0 Info: of all permit a project numb ing Agency:	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing	ubmitted nitted for g agency	d with Ap this investor for any other	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
Pern	Provid Identi invest mit No. If not 3 1	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issue included i	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency: in 1. above, p	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing lease provide th	ubmitted nitted for g agency e followin	d with Ap this investor for any other ng informa	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
Peri	Provid Identi invest mit No. If not 3.1 3.2	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issui included i Investig Investio	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency: n 1. above, p gation objecti ration method	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing lease provide th ves ls	ubmitted nitted for gagency e followin	d with Ap this investor for any other ng informa	plication tigation ner permit	ts issued fo
Pern 3.	Provid Identi invest mit No. If not 3.1 3.2 3.3	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issui included i Investig Schedu	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency: n 1. above, p gation objecti gation method le of fieldwor	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing lease provide th ves is ck. analyses and	ubmitted nitted for gagency e followin	d with Ap this invest for any oth	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
 Pern	Provid Identi invest mit No. If not 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4	Section de copies o fy permit/ igation. Issui included i Investig Investig Schedul Person	4.0 Info of all permit a project numb ing Agency: an 1. above, p gation objecti gation method le of fieldwor ael to be invo	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing lease provide th ves ls ck, analyses and lved in all phase	ubmitted nitted for gagency e followin reporting s of inves	d with Ap this investor for any other ng information	plication tigation her permit	ts issued fo
2. Perm 3.	Provid Identi invest mit No. If not 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5	Section de copies of fy permit/ igation. Issue included i Investig Investig Schedul Persone Other s application	4.0 Info: of all permit a project numb ing Agency: in 1. above, p gation objection all to be invo hishálh Nation nt, and	rmation to be S applications sub- per(s) and issuing lease provide th ves ls rk, analyses and lved in all phase on Heritage Inve	ubmitted nitted for g agency e followin reporting s of inves stigation	d with Ap this investor for any other ng information stigation Permits a	plication tigation her permit tion:	ts issued fo

Hereby applies for a *shishálh* Nation Heritage Investigation Permit and agrees to adhere to the terms and conditions listed on this application, and other further conditions attached to the application.

Applicants signature: Date:/ Location:	Applicants signature:		_Date:/	/ Location:
----------------------------------------	-----------------------	--	---------	-------------

(see terms and conditions on reverse)

	TERMS AND CONDITIONS
1.	This Heritage Investigation Permit is valid for the period indicated. The duration of the permit may be extended specific period by the <i>shishálh</i> Nation upon receipt from the permit-holder of a written application for an extension.
2.	The permit-holder shall provide the <i>shishalh</i> Nation with two (2) bound copies and one digital copy of a written report accordance with the standards established and maintained by Archaeology Planning and Assessment of the Ministr Sustainable Resource Management.
3.	A person designated by the <i>shishálh</i> Nation may at any time inspect a project being conducted under the terms conditions of the permit, including projects, records and materials recovered under authority of the permit.
4.	Upon completion of any inspection or investigation involving excavations, the permit-holder shall make reasonable ef to ensure all sites are restored as nearly as practible to their former condition.
5.	All cultural materials recovered during the course of the study shall be deposited prior to the expiry of the permit to Sechelt Indian Bands <i>tems swiya</i> Museum (P.O. Box 740, Sechelt B.C. VON 3AO) by the permit holder.
б.	The permit-holder must be present "on site" for at least 80% of all fieldwork undertaken under this Permit.
7.	In the event that human remains are identified during the course of the study covered under this permit, the permit human contact the <i>shishálh</i> Nation immediately and must not disturb the remains unless or until authorized by the <i>shis</i> Nation.
8.	A member of the <i>shishalh</i> Nation Resource Management Department will be retained as an assistant during the duration the fieldwork component of the study.
9.	Prior to the completion of the written report the permit-holder must contact the <i>shishálh</i> Nation regarding the "ersignificance" (see British Columbia Archaeological Impact Assessment Guidelines, Section 3.5.2.2) of any hermaterials found.
10.	The Sechelt Indian be given the opportunity to review and comment on the recommendations of the subsequent per report prior to report finalization.
11.	The permit holder will supply the <i>shishalh</i> Nation with a copy of the final permit report in both digital (pdf) and hard formats.

Appendix B. shíshálh Nation Heritage Investigation Permit



shíshálh Nation

(Sechelt Indian Band)

PO Box 740, Sechelt, B.C. VON 3AO (Tel: 604-885-2273/Fax: 604-885-3490/Van Direct: 1-866-885-2275)

shíshálh Nation Heritage Investigation Permit

OPY

PERMIT NUMBER:

ISSUE DATE:

EXPIRY DATE:

PROJECT LOCATION:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

NAME OF PERMIT HOLDER:

Is hereby authorized to conduct a Heritage Investigation as described in the Application by the permit-holder dated (day) (month) (year) subject to the terms and conditions set out on the reverse of this permit as well as any conditions that have been attached by the Sechelt Indian Band.

XXXXXXXXXX shíshálh Nation Rights and Title Department

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 1. This Heritage Investigation Permit is valid for the period indicated. The duration of the permit may be extended for a specific period by the *shíshálh* Nation upon receipt from the permit-holder of a written application for an extension.
- 2. The permit-holder shall provide the *shíshálh* Nation with two (2) bound copies and one digital copy of a written report, in accordance with the standards established and maintained by Archaeology Planning and Assessment of the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management.
- 3. A person designated by the *shishálh* Nation may at any time inspect a project being conducted under the terms and conditions of the permit, including projects, records and materials recovered under authority of the permit.
- 4. Upon completion of any inspection or investigation involving excavations, the permit-holder shall make reasonable efforts to ensure all sites are restored as nearly as practicle to their former condition.
- 5. All cultural materials recovered during the course of the study shall be deposited prior to the expiry of the permit to the Sechelt Indian Bands *tems swiya* Museum (P.O. Box 740, Sechelt B.C. VON 3AO) by the permit holder.
- 6. The permit-holder must be present "on site" for at least 80% of all fieldwork undertaken under this Permit.
- 7. In the event that human remains are identified during the course of the study covered under this permit, the permit holder must contact the *shíshálh* Nation immediately and must not disturb the remains unless or until authorized by the *shíshálh* Nation.
- 8. A member of the *shishálh* Nation Litigation Department will be retained as an assistant during the duration of the fieldwork component of the study.
- 9. Prior to the completion of the written report the permit-holder must contact the *shishálh* Nation regarding the "ethnic significance" (see British Columbia Archaeological Impact Assessment Guidelines, Section 3.5.2.2) of any heritage materials found.
- 10. The Sechelt Indian be given the opportunity to review and comment on the recommendations of the subsequent permit report prior to report finalization.
- 11. The permit holder will supply the *shíshálh* Nation with a copy of the final permit report in both digital (pdf) and hard copy formats.

Note: Additional terms and conditions may be required by the shishalh Nation in the Permit

Appendix C. List of terms

Heritage Properties: artifacts, spiritual sites, stories, names and traditions created by the *shíshálh* Nation.

shíshálh Nation: Sechelt Indian Band

swiya: world

tems swiya: our world

Attachment C



Squamish Nation

S<u>k</u>w<u>x</u>wú7mesh Úxwumixw Ta na wa Yúus ta Stitúyntsam-Rights and Title Department Heritage Policy 2021



2

Heritage Policy

Date of Approval:April 29, 2021Date of Next Review/Review Cycle:TBDSupersedes:NewPolicy Owner:Peter Baker, Director, Rights and Title Department

Roles & responsibilities

Role	Responsibility:
Council	Final Approval
Director, Squamish Nation Rights and Title Department	 Distribution to all external branches of Provincial and Federal Governments, as well as existing and potential stakeholders wishing to conduct business on Squamish Nation Territory Sign off Technical approval for Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Archaeology and Heritage permit applications Review, implementation, and management of Heritage Policy
Archaeology Manager, Squamish Nation Rights and Title Department	• Take part in all aspects of Archaeology and Heritage investigations from permit review, permit issuance, field work, laboratory analysis, reporting and review
Cultural and Technical Manager, Squamish Nation Rights and Title Department	• Take part in all aspects of Archaeology and Heritage investigations from permit review, permit issuance, field work, laboratory analysis, reporting and review



Forward

The Skwxwú7mesh are an Indigenous people who are a part of the Coast Salish linguistic family. The Skwxwú7mesh-ulh Stélmexw (Squamish People) have a complex and rich history. Ancient connections are traced within our language through terms for place names, shared ceremony among the Salmon Peoples of the cedar longhouse, and First Ancestors that continue to connect us in present day. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw is the Nation of Skwxwú7mesh-ulh Stélmexw that amalgamated in 1923. The Amalgamation was established to guarantee equality to all Squamish people and to ensure good government.

This policy was developed for the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Ta na wa Yuus ta Stituyntsam (Rights and Title department). In our language *Ta na wa Yuus ta Stituyntsam* means "The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down." This name refers to Stítwayntm – an inheritance, a legacy, an heirloom – but in a uniquely Skwxwú7mesh sense that could refer to our Rights and Title given to us by our ancestors to be passed on to our future generations.

This Heritage Policy is a living document and reflects the Skwxwú7mesh view on our heritage. Therefore, the policies presented here are subject to change and revision.

Skwxwú7mesh territory is defined as:

An area encompassing a total area of 6,732 square kilometers (673,200 hectares). Our Nation consists of 23 villages encompassing 28.28 square kilometers (2,828 hectares). Our lands are from Vancouver to Gibsons Landing to the area north of Howe Sound. Our territory includes some of the present-day cities of Vancouver, Burnaby and New Westminster, the cities of North Vancouver and West Vancouver, Port Moody and the entire District of Squamish and Municipality of Whistler. Our territorial boundary encompasses all of Howe Sound, Burrard Inlet and English Bay as well as the watersheds of the rivers and creeks flowing into these bodies of water. Our territory also encompasses all the islands located in Howe Sound (Figure 1).





Figure 1. Map of Skwxwú7mesh Territory.



TABLE OF CONTENTS:

PART 1 — DEFINITIONS	6
PART 2 — VISION	8
PART 3 — PURPOSE	9
PART 4 — PRINCIPLES	10
PART 5 — MANAGEMENT OF SKWXWÚ7MESH ÚXWUMIXW HERITAGE OPTIONS 13	
PART 6 — MANAGEMENT PROCESS	17
PART 7 — ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HERITAGE INVESTIGATION PERMITS AN PROCESS 18	D
PART 8 — COLLECTION OF SKWXWÚ7MESH ÚXWUMIXW MATERIALS	20
PART 9 — CURATION OF SKWXWÚ7MESH ÚXWUMIXW CULTURAL MATERIALS	22



6

PART 1 — DEFINITIONS¹

For Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Policy, we identify and define these terms:

- a. "Ancestral names" are called kw'shámin and are cultural property carried by families and their blood descendants which are given from one generation to another.
- b. "Archaeological Locations and Objects" are the material culture of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. These places are the manifestations of materials evidence of past activities. This can include more recent historical materials to very ancient archaeological objects and places as age of these materials is not a factor for the Skwxwú7mesh people. This Policy affirms that all these material remains, in likelihood, are of Skwxwú7mesh ancestry and origin. These materials are connections to our past and can include individual artifacts, features or sites.
- c. **"Belongings"** Cultural objects, intangible cultural heritage, material culture, intellectual properties, etc., that are of Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw/Indigenous origin.
- d. **"Creator"** is a term used by some Skwxwú7mesh people to refer to the Creator of the natural world and its creations.
- e. **"Cultural Locations"** are where Skwxwú7mesh cultural regalia is stored or put away as they are potentially potent with spiritual power. They can also include areas that are used for seeking spiritual power as they are our links to the spiritual realm. These places can also be associated with spiritual poles, masks and other objects.
- f. **"Designs and Arts"** are traditional images, designs and artistic styles of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw.
- g. **"Family Names"** are Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw names for peoples and families that are inherited and carried by individual Skwxwú7mesh members and families.
- h. **"Indian Doctor"** is a sxw7úmptn -- a spiritual leadership role within Skwxwú7mesh society.
- i. **"Language"** refers to the language of the Skwxwú7mesh people called Skwxwú7mesh Sníchim.
- j. **"Oral Histories and Traditions"** are many forms of narratives that originate from within the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw.
- k. **"Origin Places"** are called syawan which are places in Skwxwu7mesh territory that are associated with the creation of Skwxwu7mesh-ulh Stélmexw.
- "Place Names" are the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw's terms or names of a location or locations across our territory. They are important because they help define the significance of a location and what histories are linked to it.

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsam

"The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"

¹ Definitions provided by Ta na wa Ns7éy<u>x</u>nitm ta Snewiyálh Language & Cultural Affairs



Heritage Policy

Version: 01.13.2021

- m. "Plank House" is a historical typology in Coast Salish architectural practices.
- n. "Skwxwú7mesh" is the name of the Squamish People.
- "Skwxwú7mesh Stélmexw" means a Squamish person or Squamish people. Stélmexw means people as compared to kw'ínexw ("animals").
- p. **"Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw"** is the Skwxwú7mesh Sníchim name for the Squamish Nation. It means Squamish People as in villages, peoples, communities.
- q. "Skwxwú7mesh Sníchim" is the Squamish Language spoken by past and present-day Squamish People.
- r. "Skwxwú7mesh Territory" is the homelands and waters of the Squamish People which is described in the introduction.
- s. "Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Ancestral Human Remains" refer to the skeletal or otherwise physical remains of a dead person or persons that are likely of Skwxwú7mesh ancestry.
- t. **"Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property"** is knowledge in many forms that has passed down from generation to generation by oral history/tradition or actions that beings to Skwxwú7mesh people, families, communities or the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. While created in the past, our Intellectual Property changes and evolves as our culture needs.
- u. **"Songs and Dances"** are Skwxwú7mesh songs and dances that were and are culturally acquired or inherited.
- v. **"Snewiyálh**" means advice often on cultural customs or behavioral etiquette to be considered a good person or people.
- w. "Stl'álkem" is a Skwxwú7mesh Sníchim term for rarely encountered supernatural beings.
- x. "Syétsem" is a term in Skwxwú7mesh Sníchim that refers to true events.
- y. "Taboo" refers to customs or practices that are néma ("taboo; forbidden").
- z. "Traditional Use Areas and Sites" are places in Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw where cultural activities took place and are still taking place. These are important locations as they provide cultural continuity of our practices. These activities could have taken place long ago and carry on into contemporary times. These activities include, ritual/spiritual and ceremonial places, food collection (hunting, fishing, plant gathering or cultivation), gathering of medicinal materials, extracting resources (timber and minerals), managing resources, camping, settlements and travelling.
- aa. **"Transformation Places"** are sites and locations across Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw that were changed and created by the Xay Xaays and or other entity of the Keke7nex Siyam.
- bb. "True Stories" are called syétsem (see syétsem).
- cc. "Whoi-whoi" (see Xwáyxway).
- dd. "Xaays" ("The Transformers") are figures from Skwxwú7mesh history who encountered places and people in Skwxwú7mesh territory and transformed landscapes, people, and animals. The various stories of the Xaays are considered xay ("sacred; rare; special; supernatural").

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsam

"The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"



Heritage Policy

8

Version: 01.13.2021

- ee. **"Xexe7ének**" or **"Xexe7ének Siýẩm"** is a term used by some Skwxwú7mesh people to refer to the Creator of the natural world and its creations.
- ff. **"Xwáyxway"** (also transcribed as Whoi-Whoi) is a Squamish village located at Lumberman's Arch in Stanley Park, Vancouver.

PART 2 - VISION

With this Policy, the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw desires to inform the governments of Canada and British Columbia, the industrial sector, and the public about our interests regarding our cultural heritage. By sharing this Policy, we wish to be respected and tacit when dealing with our land, resources, and heritage. Our cultural heritage comes in many forms that are both tangible and intangible, and sharing our knowledge about this will promote a more precise understanding for all who live and work within Skwxwú7mesh territory.



PART 3 — PURPOSE

The purpose of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Policy is to be in line with our values, beliefs, and traditions, to:

- 1. Protect, manage, and preserve Skwxwú7mesh heritage in its varied forms, tangible and intangible.
- 2. Work with other individuals, institutions, and organizations in regards to our cultural heritage.
- 3. Protect, preserve, and sustain Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw cultural integrity regarding the spiritual world, our modern-day community, and our ancestors.
- 4. Through respect, sustain the cultural integrity of Skwxwú7mesh cultural knowledge, objects, and sites.
- 5. Advance and promote information about Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw cultural heritage.
- 6. Sustain continuity from our ancestors to present day by maintaining our cultural traditions and protocols.
- 7. Advance Skwxwú7mesh cultural revitalization.





10

PART 4 — PRINCIPLES

This Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Policy encompasses cultural heritage. It is guided by our sacred snewiýálh² that provide principles and values regarding the treatment of Skwxwú7mesh materials that are tangible and intangible. All are interconnected and are thematic in this policy.

Ownership and Responsibility

Skwxwú7mesh elders and knowledge keepers provide the teachings regarding the ownership and responsibility of our cultural heritage. The snewiýálh tell us that tangible and intangible materials that someone creates or is gifted with are entrusted to that person to care for e.g. songs, masks, names, dances. These tangible and intangible materials carry characteristics of that person. Knowing a person's family lineage helps determine who is responsible for caring for the material. When a person who created an object passes on, the item is similarly passed on to living custodians. Determining the ownership of multiple items in a site or place is more complex as many branches of family lineage create a meshwork of relationships from within the Skwxwú7mesh community and beyond. Some of these relationships are damaged or obscured due to the impacts of colonization, introduced diseases, inter-marriage between various cultural groups and forced relocations. However, all that is needed as part of the larger meshwork to determine that Skwxwú7mesh rights, protocols and responsibilities exist.

Policy Statement

The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw upholds ownership and jurisdiction over all Skwxwú7mesh archaeological and heritage sites and materials, be they tangible or intangible and, when they can or cannot be linked to a family or individual. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw is open to the creation of heritage related protocol agreements with other individuals, communities and organizations that are part of, or not part of, the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw community.

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsam

"The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"

² Snewiýálh means "advice" in the Skwxwú7mesh. See Part 1 for more information.

Respect

The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw believes that all things, animate and inanimate, are alive and have characteristics of their own. Thus, places and material objects are personified with the spirits of ancestors and their belongings. Archaeological and heritage sites and objects must be taken care of with respect. If they are not, harm could come to those who disturbs or collects them. These experiences can affect an individual's mental, physical, emotional and spiritual wellbeing. Therefore, respecting and upholding the integrity of places and material objects sustains a healthy community.

Policy Statement

Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and cultural sites and belongings must be treated with respect at all times.

Remembering the Past to Help the Future

The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw worldview maintains the interconnection between the past, present and future since the time of our Creation. For us there is no division between prehistory and history, or concept of pre-contact and post-contact, it is all one history punctuated by various events. We sustain our history through our genealogies and the ties that people, families and communities have to places in our territory. Our ancestral names and language terms describe how we are related. Those who are alive today are tasked with the responsibility to take care of ancestral names and pass them on to future generations.

Policy Statement

The management of archaeological and heritage sites, belongings and associated cultural knowledge must consider Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw values to protect and maintain our culture. Consideration must be given to those who came before us so that we can ensure the future for those who come after us.

Areas of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw territory may have overlap territory with neighbouring First Nations. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw shall endeavour to follow any relevant intergovernmental agreements with neighbouring First Nations.



Don't Destroy or Take Things

Since Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw sacred places and cultural belongings are personified, it is critical they are not consumed or destroyed. Careful consideration must be given to avoid taking more than what is needed. Culturally, it may be allowable to take things for use, but consideration must be given to ensure that what is being taken is not turned into excess or waste.

Policy Statement

Land and resource use must be in accordance with other Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Policy and procedures, especially our land use plan Xay Temíxw and designated cultural areas. When impacts to Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage sites are unavoidable, compensation and or measures to mitigate must be taken. Where there are conflicts with Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage sites, they must be abated and warranted.

Knowing Your History

Our responsibility as Skwxwú7mesh is to know who we are and where we come from individually (family and community) and collectively (as a Nation). To know our history, one must also know their identity. This is how our cultural rights, protocols and procedures are learned.

Policy Statement

Every effort must be made to learn Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw history in a way that is accurate and respectful to us. Proper behaviours must be followed based on our cultural rights, protocols and procedures.

PART 5 — MANAGEMENT OF SKWXWÚ7MESH ÚXWUMIXW HERITAGE OPTIONS

The British Columbia Heritage Conservation Act (HCA) offers to non-Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw investigators definitions of categories for levels of heritage significance: economic, educational, historic, scientific, and cultural. These categories are used to determine an overall heritage value for a site(s) or object(s). This Policy presents the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw's perspective on cultural value.

All Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw heritage has inherent cultural value.

Defining a cultural value rating for a site(s) or object(s), in addition to other types of significance aids in determining the level of treatment that follows this Policy's statement regarding respect. Respect of Skwxwú7mesh cultural heritage can vary from collecting cultural materials, to avoiding impacts and disturbances to a site or object. These options must be in line with Skwxwú7mesh cultural protocols. Establishing significance ratings are typically achieved through examination of development plans. The scale and scope of proposed impacts and disturbance identifies potential conflicts to a site or object and how they can possibly be resolved or identify means for materials from a site or an object to be repatriated to the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. With the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw deciding on the level of cultural significance of a site or object, the parameters for heritage management plans can ensure the respectful treatment of our history.

Establishing a high or low level of significance for Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw heritage site(s) and object(s) relates to the connection between the site or object and its original owner(s). The highest level of significance is how close a relationship we have to a site or object be it a person, family, community group or the entirety of Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. Example of such sites of locations are Xaays sites, very ancient places, and ancestral burials/remains. Examples of sites or objects that are of low significance are sites or objects that include small or disturbed sites, isolated finds of stone tool manufacturing and or scatters of faunal remains. Cultural value significance ratings should be defined as either "high" or "low." High ratings equate to a site(s) or object(s) protection and low equated to a factor to be taken into consideration with other significance factors to determine site(s) or object(s) overall heritage value. Assigning a low cultural value to a site(s) or object(s) does not equate to disrespecting Skwxwú7mesh heritage. In all cases either of high or low cultural significance, all Skwxwú7mesh heritage must be respected.



Types of Heritage Management Options

Site or Object Types	Policy
Xaays Locations	Xaays sites are to be protected and preserved from any impacts. Protection and preservation is to the site itself but also the habitats around them.
Spiritual Places and Ceremonial Regalia	Spirit power places are fixed locations and are sacred and must be protected and preserved. These locations can have both tangible and intangible aspects to them, and they are not to be disturbed if found. This means they are not to be impacted by any development, no touching or handling, visiting, photographing or depicting them in any form. Locations of these places is confidential and should be labeled as no work zones. All other data pertaining to these places is also confidential and exempt from the Freedom of Information Act.
Origin Places	The integrity of Skwxwú7mesh origin places must be sustained.
Cultural Use Sites	Access to cultural use sites and their associated resources for Skwxwú7mesh cultural use must be sustained, restored, and enhanced.
Archaeological Sites and Material Culture	Any Skwxwú7mesh heritage site(s) and object(s) including more recent historical discoveries must not be disturbed in any way without a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Permit. Even with a permit, site(s) and object(s) must not be unnecessarily impacted. Impacts to site(s) and object(s) without a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Permit will result in investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and punished under existing law.
Human Remains (including chance finds)	Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw must be immediately notified when human remains that are of Indigenous or potentially Indigenous origin are encountered.
	To aid in the determination of human remains and their potential association to the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, non-destructive and appropriate analysis should be done to

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsaṁ

"The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"

	determine ancestry, possible age of the individual(s), sex and other related information.
	When a case determines that the human remains are Indigenous and related to the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, they must be turned over the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw immediately.
	At the time of recovery, or as soon as possible after recover, the remains must be placed in a cedar box and wrapped in a red cotton or wool cloth. This must be done under the instruction of a representative of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw.
	With the approval of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, there are many types of analysis that may be permitted, including sampling for a DNA, stable isotopes and 14C dating. Any physical analysis must be done by a suitably qualified physical anthropologist and overseen by a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw representative. If desired by the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, these types of analysis, if any, should be carried out before reburial.
	Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw cultural advisors can facilitate reburial procedures. They are available upon request. Reburial of human remains must be done as soon as possible.
Intellectual Property	This Policy addresses Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property as a whole. Place Names and Language are addressed elsewhere. Here, Intellectual Property refers to Ownership, Consent, Recognition, Misrepresentation and Fair Use.
	Ownership of Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property are Skwxwú7mesh individuals, families, communities or the entire Nation, that hold Indigenous rights in and ownership of intellectual properties that are from and part of Skwxwú7mesh culture.
	Consent to use Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property requires informed consent from the owner(s) of Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property. Owners can include individuals, a family, a community, or Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Council. Consent must be attained before use of Skwxwú7mesh
	Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituvntsam 15

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsaṁ

"The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"

	Úxwumixw knowledge and in some situations, is exempt as "Fair Use."
	Recognition of Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property is the correct and proper credited, quoted and referred to use.
	Misrepresentation of Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property means that no one individual may claim or state they are of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw or are affiliated with us in any way without the verification of such as claim.
	Fair Use refers to parts of Skwxwú7mesh Intellectual Property that can be used for educational, information dissemination, commentary, or for profit that is properly referenced. Prior consent is preferred but, in some cases, not required.
Place Names	This Policy encourages the use and (re) application of Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw place names within our territory given that they are approved, accurate, appropriate and evaluated by the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw prior to their use.
Language	With permission from the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, this Policy requires the use of the Squamish Language if it is correct and consistent in the application. The Squamish Language Dictionary available at most bookstores can be consulted for correct spelling.
Exchange, Sale, Theft or Trade of Cultural Materials	The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw prohibits the trade or exchange, theft, or sale of all Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw cultural and heritage materials such as artifacts, ceremonial regalia, spiritual items and things associated with Xay Xaays sites. Exclusion of these are common marketable resources such as cedar and fish.

PART 6 — MANAGEMENT PROCESS

This section outlines and defines the terms and conditions under which Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage permits require consideration in relation to their disturbance. This section is meant to aid in the assessment of Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage sites.

Assessment Requirements

The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw requires that the disturbance and impacts to our history must be considered, assessed and or mitigated. Archaeological and cultural projects occur either as a Preliminary Field Reconnaissance (PFR), Archaeological/Heritage Overview Assessment (AOA or HOA) or an Archaeological/Heritage Impact Assessment (AIA or HIA). For each, there are qualifications for the inspectors that must be of an appropriate level of experience and training that are outlined in the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Archaeological and Heritage Permits. Other types of archaeological and cultural inspection projects that are not related to industrial developments share similar requirements.

Overview Assessments

The purpose of PFR and AOA or HOA is to locate and identify Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage sites (as defined in this Policy) in a defined project area development plan. PFRs and AOA/HOAs objectives typically categorize what the potential impacts on Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage sites will be within a development plan and the level of risk for impacts in any associated proposed development.

Impact Assessments

The purpose of Impact Assessments (AIA/HIA) is to locate and identify all potential conflicts between Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage sites and the development plan. An Impact Assessment will develop ways and options that will seek to avoid or mitigate impacts to Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw sites. These recommendations must be consistent with the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw permitting process. For larger scale and scope projects recommendations can include many phases of site inventory or data collection so that they are consistent with the creation of a suitable management plan.

PART 7 — ARCHAEOLOGICAL/HERITAGE INVESTIGATION PERMITS AND PROCESS

This section presents the roles and responsibilities of those applying for permits within Skwxwú7mesh territory. Furthermore, it outlines how the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw's permitting process operates for those directing investigations either for Cultural Resource Management (CRM) or research (academic or otherwise). To do these types of activities the director must obtain a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeology or heritage permit. It is required for all archaeological studies and or heritage investigations within Skwxwú7mesh territory.

Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw does not want to hinder the careers of archaeologists or other professionals but seeks appropriate documentation related to our permit requirements. Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw prefers that permit applicants be a Field Director as defined by the British Columbia Archaeology Branch guidelines. Those who do not meet these qualifications need to indicate a Field Director in their permit application who will oversee their work. Those who are not a field director or supervisor must also submit a cover letter that showcases their ability to be able to meet the requirements of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw policy and permit along with a resume or Curricula Vitae (C.V.). This information will be requested to be updated on a yearly basis. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw also encourages permit applicants to be members of their respective professional organizations and abide by established ethical standards of their discipline.

Those who desire to conduct such projects are required to submit a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological or heritage Permit Application (appendix 1) to the Rights and Title contact listed on the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw website. All permit applications must be accompanied by the associated processing fee (appendix 2). All applicants must be aware of the terms and conditions listed on the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage Permit application. Digital and hard copies are available upon request. Applications are to be in both digital and hard copies. Digital signatures are accepted.

Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw requires that (when available) a community archaeologist, field technician, or cultural advisor play a part in all aspects of archaeological and heritage investigations - from permit review, permit issuance, field work, laboratory analysis, reporting and report review. A Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw representative will provide a contact list of qualified personnel to work with the permit applicant. Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw requires at least five business days to provide a suitable list of community members to partake in the project. Availability of community members may vary with workload.

When an application and processing fee are received, a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Rights and Title Archaeologist will review the file for its technical content. Comments regarding each application will be returned with comments related to this Policy. These comments will either be points for discussion, revision and or re-submission. Technical approval for permit applications will be associated with a permit number and signed by the head of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Rights and Title Department Director. E-mail approval will be the method of permit issuance.

Before a permitted project is completed, the permit holder is required to submit a final draft or interim report draft for review and comments along with appropriate new or revised site forms. Additionally, a complete Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage Permit Summary (appendix 3) as related to permit conditions is required for review. Relevant comments will be provided.

Conducting any form of archaeological or cultural investigations without a permit as defined by this Policy, or failure to comply with its terms and conditions, is a direct violation of this Policy. This will lead to penalties noted on the applicants record and can lead to exclusion from future permits from the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. It is encouraged that permit applicants acquire all other forms of permits from federal, provincial and First Nations communities with shared interests (as defined by territorial maps), before doing any work under a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological or heritage permit. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Policy and permitting system is separate from but works in compatibility with other First Nations permit(s). It is based on our interests for Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeology and cultural heritage.

Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage permits are NOT to be considered as statements of title exclusive of other First Nations interests. Although this Policy and permitting system is independent it must be understood that the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw works in conjunction with the policies and protocols of other First Nations who have shared heritage interests and are in some way linked to the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw.

Issuance of a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw permit **does not mean consultation** on involvement in a project. Permit issuance is entirely separate from the consultation process that is part of any development plan or proposal. Issuing a permit does in no way meet the requirements of the proponent to do their consultative duties with Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw. Permits that are issued only meet the technical requirements for associated archaeological and cultural investigations. Issuance of a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Heritage permit does not justify infringement of Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Rights and Title.

PART 8 — COLLECTION OF SKWXWÚ7MESH MATERIALS

This section presents the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw's perspective related to the collection of cultural materials. Typically, there are 2 cases whereby Skwxwú7mesh cultural materials have been collected.

- 1. Those related to archaeological and heritage related investigations due to academic research or Cultural Resource Management (CRM) and,
- 2. Chance finds

Scale of Collection- Minor and Major

Minor Testing and Disturbance

For site survey inventory, PFRs, overview assessments, impact assessments, projects where the main goal is to find and delineate Skwxwú7mesh archaeological and or heritage sites by using a range of subsurface testing (shovel, auger, borehole etc.). All investigators should record, describe, and examine cultural materials in the field and reinter or replace them where they were found. Re-interred materials must be placed in a bag with the date, the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw permit number, test number and or provenience as a label. All finds must be plotted in a properly scaled map.

The reasoning behind this approach is to:

1. Minimize disturbances to Skwxwú7mesh archaeological and heritage sites,

2. Curtail the collection of materials beyond what is needed for the scale of these types of projects,

3. Reduce the amount of space needed in any given repository.

If the collection of Skwxwú7mesh archaeological and cultural materials is needed due to potential impacts to a site, then collection of those materials should be done given:

1. The object is diagnostic (e.g. rare and provides significant data to Skwxwú7mesh history),

2. It is in danger of being displaced and or destroyed by natural or industrial processes,

3. It is under threat from collection of someone who does not have a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage investigation permit.

Major Testing and Disturbance

Ta na wa Yúus ta Stituyntsaṁ "The Ones Who Take Care of What Was Handed Down or What Will Be Handed Down"

If the project regards research, data collection, mitigation studies that will be large in scale and scope, then all archaeological and heritage materials must be collected during excavation.

Chance Finds

Chance finds are also known as incidental finds and can be Skwxwú7mesh cultural materials found on the earth's surface or encountered when there is ground disturbance. Under Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw archaeological and heritage investigation permits, it is encouraged that these finds be left in place unless they are under threat of high disturbance or destruction via natural or industrial means. If under threat, these materials must be collected. If not under threat, then the permitted investigator must follow the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw Chance Find Protocol (appendix 4).
PART 9 — CURATION OF SKWXWÚ7MESH ÚXWUMIXW CULTURAL MATERIALS

Cultural materials collected under a Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw permit must be curated at a suitable location that has appropriate facilities. The repositories for Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw cultural materials must meet national standards for proper curation, be provincially recognized and hold cultural materials in trust of the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw and any other associated First Nations groups. The Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw offers 2 options for this.

1. If cultural materials are collected from a previously investigated site and are curated at an established facility, Squamish Nation prefers the site collection remains together.

2. Collected cultural materials may be curated at the Royal British Columbia Museum (RBCM), the Laboratory of Archaeology (LOA) at the University of British Columbia or other acceptable repository agreeable to the Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw and held "in trust." Skwxwu7mesh Uxwumixw insists that collections from a site go to a single repository. This will maintain curatorial consistency for archaeological and heritage sites that have seen previous testing, excavation or collection.

PART 10 — REVIEW AND APPROVAL

This policy shall be reviewed biannually by the Squamish Nation staff and presented to Council for consideration.

The policy is approved by the Squamish Nation Council on ______ by the following resolution:

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Stephen Misiurak, Manager, Capital Projects

SUBJECT: CHURCH ROAD WELL FIELD PROJECT CONSTRUCTION – UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the report titled Church Road Well Field Project Construction - Update be received for information.

BACKGROUND

On January 13, 2022, the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) formally awarded the Church Road Well Field Project construction contract to Maycon Construction Ltd. (Maycon), in the amount up to \$7,585,265 excluding taxes, as well as consulting contracts for construction management and archeological monitoring.

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with a project status update of the construction activities for this project.

DISCUSSION

Status update

The formal preconstruction meeting was held with staff, the consultant engineer (Associated Environmental), and Maycon on February 24, 2022.

A preliminary schedule has been submitted to the SCRD by Maycon, and at the time of the writing of this Committee report, the contractor's proposed work activities and durations consist of the following:

- March 7 21 Tree removal and erosion control setup
- March 21 Mobilization
- April 4 June 28 Watermains construction
- July 25 August 22 Road restoration and paving
- March 28 August 28 Water Treatment Plant construction
- Late summer/early fall Commissioning

Financial Implications

The overall project budget is as shown in Table 1, which was provided to the Board at the January 13, 2022 Board meeting. All costs are tracking within the allocated budgets except for the BC Hydro fee. On February 17, 2022, staff received notification from BC Hydro that the final cost of their work to complete the power line upgrades to service the new water treatment plant at 850 Fisher Road is \$175,345, which is more than the \$150,000 estimate. A report is included in this

Committee agenda recommending approval to fund the \$25,435 shortfall from the AAP approved funding.

Table 1 - Project Expenses	Incurred/Projected
----------------------------	--------------------

Expenses	Church Road Phase 4	Water Distribution Mains
Incurred to Date	\$1,006,134	\$270.83
Construction (Maycon Construction Ltd.)	\$6,167,466	\$1,067,799
Construction Management Services (Associated Environmental)	\$930,686	
Archaeological Monitoring Services (In-Situ)	\$84,673	
BC Hydro Construction Costs	\$175,435	
Staff Time and Miscellaneous Expenditures	\$50,000	\$10,000
Contingency Allowance Construction Activities	\$350,000	\$100,000
Contingency Allowance Construction Oversight	\$50,000	
Total Costs	\$8,814,394	\$1,178,070

Timeline for next steps

As per the preliminary schedule from Maycon, site clearing and preparation is expected to have begun on March 7. Construction preparation activities will ramp up at the end of March, with work on the watermains and the water treatment plant building both expected to begin in April 2022.

All parties involved recognize the importance of this project and will make every effort to ensure the work is completed and the system is commissioned by late summer/early fall.

The next project status update report will be included in the May 2022 Infrastructure Services Committee agenda.

Communications Strategy

In early February 2022, a project update notice was mailed out to residents in the immediate project area. This notice outlined the key construction activities and the project schedule, as well as giving some preparation for how they may be impacted throughout construction. It also provided information for residents that wish to sign up for a mailing list to stay updated with new project information.

Communication with the broader public will be handled through the SCRD Let's Talk Water page, as well as other social media. The Let's Talk Page is now live and staff have already been addressing questions coming in from the general public.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

The Groundwater Investigation Project supports the SCRD Board's 2019-2023 Strategic Plan to plan for and ensure year-round water availability now and in the future.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with a summary progress update of the project construction activities completed to date and to provide the Board with the anticipated major construction work activities.

Reviewed by:			
Manager		Finance	
GM	X - R. Rosenboom	Legislative	
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Other	

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Trevor Rutley, Capital Projects Senior Coordinator

SUBJECT: CHURCH ROAD WATER TREATMENT PLANT ELECTRICAL POWER SUPPLY UPGRADES

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Church Road Water Treatment Plant Electrical Power Supply Upgrades be received for information;

AND THAT the delegated authorities be authorized to execute the contract and payment with BC Hydro for the Church Road Water Treatment Plant power upgrades in the amount of \$175,435.

BACKGROUND

As part of the design phase for the Church Road Well Field Project it was identified that the power supply to the proposed water treatment plant (WTP) site would need to be upgraded to phase three voltage. Currently, the site only has single-phase power available and three-phase power is required to run the large pumps that are to be installed in the new WTP.

BC Hydro is responsible for designing and constructing the upgrades to the electricity distribution system. When electrical supply upgrades are required, an application is submitted to BC Hydro who then completes the design of the required upgrades. An invoice is submitted to the applicant for the design and construction costs, along with a list of other requirements, when the design is complete. BC Hydro then completes the upgrades using their own construction contractor. As the electrical distribution system is owned and maintained by BC Hydro, there is no alternative to this process.

The purpose of this report is to align with the SCRD's Delegation Bylaw and Purchasing Policy in approving contract expenditures over \$100,000

DISCUSSION

Analysis

In March 2020, staff engaged with BC Hydro to begin the design of the power supply upgrades for the Church Road WTP and a deposit of \$5,000 was paid at that time.

The upgrade to three-phase power is required for the new WTP equipment to be functional for commissioning. The upgrades will include replacement of hydro poles with taller poles along Central Avenue from Marine Avenue to Fisher Road, and along Fisher Road from Central Avenue to across from the WTP site at 850 Fisher Road.

BC Hydro is the ultimate decision maker on modifications to their distribution network, such as the one required for this project. BC Hydro reviewed the available routing options and concluded that this alignment was the most feasible. One alterative option assessed was burying the lines along Church Road and Elphinstone Ave, but this option was considered not feasible due to

Page 2 of 4

space limitations given that are several new watermains will already be installed along Elphinstone Avenue. Burrying the lines along Central Avenue and Fisher Road was assets as well and would have resulted in an additional expense of between \$500,000 and \$750,000 related to the excavation and reconstruction of the road.

On February 16, 2022, the Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) received the design from BC Hydro and was followed up with an invoice in the amount of \$175,435 for design and construction of the required upgrades.

Financial Implications

The Church Road Well Field Project construction budget is \$8,788,959. The budget included an allowance of \$150,000 for BC Hydro installation costs, which was an estimate based on preliminary discussions with BC Hydro. The construction budget also includes \$350,000 in construction contingency.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the project budget, including the estimated cost for the BC Hydro upgrades, that was approved at the January 13, 2022 Board meeting.

Expenses	Church Road Phase 4
Incurred to Date	\$1,006,134
Construction Including Contingency	\$6,517,466
Consulting Services Including Contingency	\$1,065,359
BC Hydro Construction Costs (estimate)	\$150,000
Staff Time and Miscellaneous Expenditures	\$50,000
Contingency Allowance Construction Activities	\$350,000
Contingency Allowance Construction Oversight	\$50,000
Total Costs	\$8,788,959

Table 1 – Current Church Road Well Field Project Budget

As the actual costs from BC Hydro are more that the estimated value, the budget for this project component will need to be increased to make up the shortfall.

It is recommended that the additional \$25,435 be funded from the available construction contingency. The recommended Church Road Well Field Project budget, including the increased BC Hydro fees, is provided in Table 2. Staff are confident that the remaining construction contingency will be adequate for the remaining work on this project.

Page 3 of 4

	Church Road Phase 4
Current Available Budget	\$8,788,959
Current Construction Contingency	\$350,000
Recommended Additional Funding	\$25,435
Revised Construction Contingency	\$324,565
Total Project Costs	\$8,788,959
Balance	\$0

Table 2 - Recommended Church Road Well Field Project budget

Timeline for next steps

The BC Hydro Terms and Conditions outline several activities that are to be completed prior to BC Hydro starting their construction, including the payment of the invoice. Staff are working to ensure that all other pre-requisite activities are completed promptly to avoid any potential project delay.

As per the Terms and Conditions submitted with the invoice, BC Hydro will have 35 days to construct the upgrades upon completion of the pre-requisite activities. While the exact timing is subject to contractor scheduling of some of the pre-requisite activities by BC Hydro, it is expected that the electrical upgrades will be completed in early summer 2022.

Communications Strategy

The BC Hydro upgrades have been included in communications to the public about the Church Road Well Field Project. With the detailed design now received from BC Hydro, Staff will send more specific communication to the residents in the immediate project area about the scope of the upgrades, potential impacts to view corridors and the timing of the works. This will be in addition to any communications that will come direct from BC Hydro.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This project is in alignment with Strategic Focus Area 2 of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan – Asset Stewardship. Specifically, the Church Road project is consistent with the strategy to 'plan for and ensure year-round water availability now and in the future'.

This project is also consistent with the goals of other Strategic Focus Areas including:

- Community Resilience and Climate Change Adaptation; by reducing dependency on surface water supply in the Chapman Water System thereby reducing vulnerability to seasonal drought.
- Engagement and Communications; by proactively providing updates to the immediately affected residents and pursuing a variety of methods to ensure the community is kept informed of the project.

²⁰²²⁻MAR-10 ISC staff report Church Road Water Treatment Plant Electrical Supply Upgrades

CONCLUSION

In March 2020, staff engaged BC Hydro to begin design of power upgrades required to service the new Church Road WTP. In February 2022, BC Hydro completed the design and submitted an invoice to the SCRD to complete the power upgrades. Staff recommend payment of the invoice in the amount of \$175,435, with \$150,000 to be funded from the existing project budget and the remaining \$25,435 to be funded from the available construction contingency.

Reviewed by:				
Manager	X - S. Misiurak	Finance	X - T. Perreault	
GM	X - R. Rosenboom	Legislative		
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Purchasing	X - V. Cropp	

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

- **TO:** Infrastructure Services Committee March 10, 2022
- AUTHOR: Trevor Rutley, Capital Projects Senior Coordinator
- SUBJECT: CHAPMAN CREEK WATER TREATMENT PLANT ON-SITE HYPOCHLORITE GENERATION PROJECT – CONTRACT AMENDMENT NO. 2

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Chapman Creek Water Treatment Plant On-Site Hypochlorite Generation Project - Contract Amendment No. 2 be received for information;

AND THAT the contract with CHB Services Ltd. be amended with an increase of \$100,000, to a total of \$1,718,820 (excluding GST);

AND THAT the delegated authorities be authorized to execute the amended contract;

AND FURTHER THAT a 2023 Budget Proposal be brought forward for the chlorination system decommissioning project.

BACKGROUND

At the February 25, 2021 Board meeting, the budget for the design and construction of an onsite hypochlorite generation system at the Chapman Creek Water Treatment Plant (WTP) was increased to \$1,644,902 (resolution 046/21).

At the September 9, 2021 Board meeting, the following resolution was adopted:

249/21 (in part) **Recommendation No. 3**

Invitation to Tender (ITT) 2137009 Contract Award Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation – Construction

AND THAT a contract for Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation be awarded to CHB Services Ltd. in the amount up to \$1,118,820 (plus GST);

AND THAT the contract with Associated Environmental for Construction Management, Engineering, and Post Construction Engineering Services for the Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation be increased from \$117,171 up to an amount not to exceed \$304,348 (plus GST) to provide Construction Management and Post Construction Engineering Services for the Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation Project;

AND FURTHER THAT the delegated authorities be authorized to execute both contracts.

At the November 25, 2021 Board meeting, the project budget was increased to reflect the correct bid price through the adoption of the following resolution:

249/21 (in part) <u>Recommendation No. 8</u> Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation Project – Contract Amendment No. 1

AND THAT the project for the Chapman Creek WTP On-Site Hypochlorite Generation – Construction be increased to \$2,144,903 from \$1,644,903 and that the additional \$500,000 be funded from Regional Water capital reserves;

And That the delegated authorities be authorized to execute the Contract Amendment No. 1 with CHB Services Ltd. in the amount of \$500,000 (excluding GST);

AND FURTHER THAT the 2021-2025 Financial Plan Bylaw be amended accordingly.

The purpose of this report is to request approval for Contract Amendment No. 2 to the Chapman Creek WTP on-site hypochlorite generation (OSG) system construction contract.

DISCUSSION

Analysis

During final design and tendering, it was identified that as per the Roberts Creek Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 641, a Development Permit (DP) was required for this project given that the location of the chemical storage structure was within 30 m of a nearby steep slope. The time it took to process and issue the DP resulted in the issuance of the formal project Notice to Proceed (NTP) occurring several months after the Board contract award issuance.

Between September 9, 2021, when the initial project contract was awarded, and December 22, 2021, when the NTP was issued, vendor pricing for the key and integral piece of equipment required for the OSG system increased by \$53,500. Specifically, increases in the following material costs associated have and continue to increase by the following percentages:

- PVC 40-50%
- Titanium 80%
- stainless steel 20%

Both CHB Services Ltd. and Associated Engineering, the SCRD's project's construction manager for this project, contacted other vendors for this equipment to verify costing information and the selected vendor offered the best available pricing.

As the current amended contract does not include any contingency allowance, staff are recommending an additional \$46,500 be approved for a construction contingency in the event of any further unforeseen expenses that may arise through construction.

Financial Implications

As shown in Table 1, the current approved funding is \$2,144,903. This includes an allowance for decommissioning of the current chlorination system of \$169,832. Given the delays in the project to date and the anticipated delivery and construction timeline for some of the critical components this fall, it's recommended to use part of this allowance to fund the costs increase for the OSG equipment and the recommended contingency allowance. The remaining budget for this project component would be sufficient to complete the required engineering design and

costs estimate for the decommissioning. Based on this information staff will bring forward a 2023 Budget Proposal for the actual decommissioning of the current chlorination system.

Table 1 – Chapman Creek WTP OSG

	Current	Amended
Approved Budget	\$2,144,903	\$2,144,903
Staff Wages and Other Expenses	\$51,903	\$51,903
Design and construction Management Contract		
Associated Engineering	\$304,348	\$304,348
Construction contract CHB Services	\$1,618,820	\$1,718,820
Design Chlorination system Decommissioning	\$169,832	\$69,832
Total Project Expenditures	\$2,144,903	\$2,144,903

Timeline for next steps

Construction is currently underway on the installation of the OSG system and is anticipated to be complete and commissioned by winter 2022. A 2023 Budget Proposal will be brought forward for the actual decommissioning of the current chlorination system

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

The purchasing process followed for this service is aligned with the SCRD Procurement Policy.

CONCLUSION

Due to inflation, the vendor pricing for the integral key piece of equipment required for the OSG system increased by \$53,500 between CHB Services Ltd.'s bid submission in July 2021 and the formal approval of the full construction contract value, in November 2021. Staff recommend that the construction contract with CHB Services Ltd. be amended to include the \$53,500, plus \$46,500 as contingency allowance, for a total amended contract value of \$1,718,820 (plus GST).

A 2023 Budget Proposal will be presented for the chlorination system decommissioning aspect of the project.

Reviewed by			
Manager	X - S. Misiurak	Finance	X - T. Perreault
GM	X - R. Rosenboom	Legislative	
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Purchasing	X - V. Cropp

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Remko Rosenboom, General Manager, Infrastructure Services

SUBJECT: GREEN WASTE PROCESSING CONTRACT UPDATES

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Green Waste Processing Contract Updates be received for information;

AND THAT the contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. for green waste processing services be extended for an additional two (2) year period to December 31, 2024;

AND THAT the contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. be increased by \$785,100 to \$1,484,400 (not including GST);

AND THAT the delegated authorities be authorized to execute the contract;

AND FURTHER THAT a 2023 Budget Proposal be brought forward for overall funding options for the Green Waste Program.

BACKGROUND

The Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) has a contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. to process green waste received at the three drop-off locations for residential self-hauled green waste and the two commercial green waste drop-off locations. At the January 9, 2020 regular Board meeting, the contract was awarded for a three-year period from Request for Proposals 1935004 (Res No. 006/20). The contract expires on December 31, 2022 and can be extended for one additional two-year period.

The purpose of this report is to seek Board approval to extend the existing contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. for green waste processing services and to amend the contract to increase the total contract value. As the contract value is above \$100,000, such amendments require Board approval.

DISCUSSION

The SCRD green waste recycling program provides collection locations for residents to self-haul and drop-off yard and garden green waste at the South Coast Residential Green Waste Drop-off Depot, Pender Harbour Transfer Station, and Salish Soils (on behalf of the Sechelt Landfill) as well as two commercial sector green waste drop-off locations. The collected green waste is processed into compost by Salish Environmental Group Inc.

2022 Projections

The current contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. is in the final year of a three-year term. However, the total contract value of \$699,300 is expected to be exceeded by May 2022 due to the increase in volume of green waste received since the start of the project.

The current contract value was based on 2018 green waste tonnage. The green waste tonnage, however, has steadily increased to an annual total of 5,265 tonnes in 2020 and 4,986 tonnes in 2021. A summary of the combined weight (by tonne) of green waste dropped off at SCRD green waste locations is included below.



For 2022, there is 5,200 tonnes of green waste expected to be processed.

Staff therefore recommend to amend the contract with Salish Environmental Group Inc. to increase the total contract value to reflect the increased tonnage for 2022.

Contract extension

The SCRD has benefitted from Salish Environmental Group Inc.'s ability to provide this service. The details within the contract support the SCRD's Solid Waste Management Plan, outlining greenhouse gas reduction and waste diversion.

Salish Environmental Group Inc. is interested in extending their contract for green waste processing for one additional two-year term as permitted in the contract.

As such, staff recommend to extend the contract for one additional two-year period. During this period the anticipated tonnage of green waste expected to be processed is 10,500 tonnes.

Financial Implications

The actual total annual costs for green waste processing are based on the tonnage received at the SCRD green waste drop-off locations. An increase to the green waste tonnage the SCRD receives, which requires processing into compost, results in higher contracted costs. A summary of the overall green waste processing budget is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1 –	Overall G	reen Waste	Processing	Budget 2022
-----------	-----------	------------	------------	-------------

	Approved Annual Budget	Projected 2022 Budget Required	Difference
Green Waste Processing	\$239,400	\$296,400	\$57,000
Total	\$239,400	\$296,400	\$57,000

The current approved annual budget for green waste processing is \$239,400, whereas the projected amount required is \$296,400 for 2022. This program is typically funded through taxation. For 2022, there may be sufficient funding within the Landfills' base budgets to cover the shortfall, however, it will not be known until year-end. Therefore, if a budget shortfall occurs, staff will bring forward a 2023 Budget Proposal to rectify funding sources for the Green Waste Program.

A summary of the overall green waste contract costs is summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Green Waste Processing Contract Value Details

	Cost
Original Contract Value – 3 Year	\$699,300
Projected Increase to Year 3 Contract value based on materials received to date	\$155,000
Contract Extension Value (2 Years)	\$630,100
Total Contract Value	\$1,484,400

The additional budget of \$155,000 for the current contract reflects the higher than anticipated tonnages received in 2020 and 2021 and anticipated tonnage for 2022.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

The green waste program supports the existing landfill ban for green waste and supports the SCRD's Solid Waste Management Plan's goal of 65%-69% diversion.

CONCLUSION

The SCRD entered into a three-year contract in 2020 with Salish Environmental Group Inc. for green waste processing services from SCRD green waste collection locations.

The contract expires on December 31, 2022. The original contract includes the option to extend the contract for one (1) additional two (2) year term. Staff recommend extending the contract for the additional two (2) year term and to bring forward a 2023 Budget Proposal to guarantee sustainable funding of this program for future years.

Reviewed by:				
Manager		Finance	X - T. Perreault	
GM	X - R. Rosenboom	Legislative		
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Other	X - V. Cropp	

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Shane Walkey, Manager, Utility Services

SUBJECT: VEHICLE PURCHASES: RFP 2111604 AWARD RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Vehicle Purchases: RFP 2111604 Award Recommendation be received for information;

AND THAT a contract for the purchase of two vehicles be awarded to South Coast Ford Sales in the amount up to \$86,215 (excluding GST);

AND THAT the contract for the purchase of three vehicles be awarded to Commercial Truck Equipment Co. in the amount up to \$274,937 (excluding GST);

AND THAT the delegated authorities be authorized to execute the purchase;

AND THAT the project budget of \$84,824 for the South Pender Harbour Water Service Area vehicle purchase, approved through Board Resolution No. 046/21, be funded from Municipal Finance Authority (MFA) short term loan;

AND THAT a loan of up to \$84,824 for a term of 5 years be requested through the Municipal Finance Authority Equipment Financing Program under section 403(1) of the *Local Government Act* (Liabilities Under Agreement) to fund the purchase of the vehicle;

AND THAT the project budget of \$238,245 for Regional Water Service Area vehicle purchases, approved through Board Resolutions No. 004/20, No. 381/20 and No. 046/21, be funded from Municipal Finance Authority (MFA) short term loan;

AND THAT a loan up to \$238,245 for a term of 5 years be requested through the Municipal Finance Authority Equipment Financing Program under section 403 (1) of the *Local Government Act* (Liabilities Under Agreement) to fund the purchase of the vehicles;

AND FURTHER THAT this recommendation be forwarded to the Regular Board meeting of March 10, 2022.

BACKGROUND

The Board adopted the following resolution, that pertains to vehicle 5 (fully electric passenger vehicle), at the January 9, 2020 Regular Board meeting:

004/20 (part) <u>Recommendation No. 31</u> Regional Water Service [370] – 2020 R1 Budget Proposals

THAT the following budget proposal be approved and incorporated into the 2020 Round 2 Budget:

 Budget Proposal 16 – Utility Vehicle Purchase, \$46,500 funded through MFA 5-Year Equipment Finance Loan;

The Board adopted the following resolution, that pertains to vehicle 6 (fully electric passenger vehicle), at the November 26, 2020 Regular Board meeting:

381/20 (part) **Recommendation No. 15** Infrastructure Services Projects

AND THAT the following 2020 Carry-Forward project be amended in the 2020-2024 Financial Plan as follows:

 [370] Vehicle Purchases – Strategic Infrastructure Division – reduce purchase to 1 versus 2 [fully electric passenger] vehicles (Short Term Debt);

The Board adopted the following resolutions, that pertains to vehicle 7 (Bylaw Enforcement: plugin hybrid vehicle), and vehicles 1, 2, 3 and 4 (South Pender and Regional Water Trucks) at the February 25, 2021 Regular Board meeting:

046/21 (part) <u>Recommendation No. 32</u> Bylaw Enforcement [200] – 2021 R1 Budget Proposals

AND THAT the following budget proposal be approved and incorporated into the 2021 Round 2 Budget:

 Budget Proposal 1 – Bylaw Vehicle, \$50,000 funded through Capital Reserves;

046/21 (part) <u>Recommendation No. 64</u> South Pender Water Service [366] – 2021 R1 Budget Proposals

AND THAT the following budget proposal be approved and incorporated into the 2021 Round 2 Budget:

• Budget Proposal 5 – Vehicle Purchases, \$80,000 funded through MFA 5-Year Equipment Finance Loan (with potential for Grant Funding);

046/21 (part) **Recommendation No. 68** *Regional Water Service* [370] – 2021 R1 Budget *Proposals*

AND THAT the following budget proposal be approved and incorporated into the 2021 Round 2 Budget:

• Budget Proposal 7 – Vehicle Purchases, \$210,000 funded through MFA 5-Year Equipment Finance Loan (with potential for Grant Funding);

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was published on December 24, 2021 for the supply and delivery of seven (7) various vehicles to support the Bylaw Enforcement, South Pender Harbour Water and Regional Water Service Area departments. The RFP closed on January 26, 2022.

The purpose of this report is to summarize the results of the RFP process and make a purchase recommendation for the supply and delivery of the various vehicles identified above.

DISCUSSION

Purchasing received two (2) compliant proposals as part of the RFP offer process. Led by Purchasing, the evaluation team consisted of four (4) team members. The Evaluation Committee

reviewed and scored the proposals against the criteria set out in RFP. Staff have recommended that purchases be awarded to both Commercial Truck Equipment Co. and South Coast Ford as they met the specifications as outlined and are the highest scoring proponents for best value.

In the following section of this report, Table 1 has outlined the various vehicle budgets and bid values received for the vehicles. Several bids received for certain vehicle types were higher than originally budgeted for, primarily due to current market/supply conditions that have resulted in fewer submissions and higher pricing than anticipated. Staff are recommending, in certain instances, to utilize pooled budgeted vehicle funding to accommodate these variances and purchase vehicles that are good value for the organization and meet the required specifications of the departments.

The bids received for fully electric passenger vehicles were considerably higher than budgeted amounts and Staff are recommending <u>not</u> to purchase these vehicles.

The following section will outline the various pricing submissions received as well as identifying the associated budgets and funding sources that Staff are recommending.

Financial Implications

The existing funding for the purchase of these vehicles are incorporated into the Bylaw Enforcement, South Pender Harbour Water and Regional Water Service Area departmental budgets.

The following table outlines the vehicle numbers and vehicle budgets with the highest scoring proponents' bids that were determined as the best value submissions.

Vehicle No.	Highest Scoring Proponent	Vehicle Type	Service Area	Vehicle Budget	*RFP 211604 Pricing	Balance Variance
1	South Coast Ford	Light Duty Pickup Truck	Regional Water [370]	\$50,000	\$48,132	\$1,868
2	Commercial Truck Equipment	Medium Duty Pickup Truck	South Pender Harbour Water [366]	\$80,000	\$84,824	(\$4,824)
3	Commercial Truck Equipment	Medium Duty Pickup Truck	Regional Water [370]	\$80,000	\$84,824	(\$4,824)
4	Commercial Truck Equipment	Flat Bed Truck w/ Dump	Regional Water [370]	\$80,000	\$105,288	(\$25,288)
<u>5</u>	<u>Cancelled</u>					
<u>6</u>	Cancelled					
7	South Coast Ford	Plug-In Hybrid 4x4 or SUV	Bylaw Enforcement [210]	\$50,000	\$38,082	\$11,918

Table 1: Vehicle Purchase Budgets vs RFP 2111604 Pricing

*RFQ 1937007 pricing inclusive of PST (does not include GST)

Vehicles 1 and 7 received bids that met all the required specifications and were under budget. South Coast Ford submitted the highest scoring bids for these two vehicles and Staff are recommending that the supply and delivery of these vehicles be awarded to South Coast Ford in the amount of \$86,215 (including PST and excluding GST).

Vehicles 2 and 3 (medium duty, 4x4 trucks w/ service bodies) received bids from Commercial Truck Equipment Co. that not only met the mandatory requirements outlined in the RFP but in many instances exceeded the minimum specifications. The vehicle types submitted by Commercial Truck Equipment Co. will provide the South Pender Harbour Water Service Area (SPHWSA) and Regional Water Service Area (RWSA) with reliable and functional pieces of equipment. Although the bids submitted for Vehicles 2 and 3 were slightly over the individual vehicle budgets (+6%), due to the excellent value and quality of the submission, Staff recommend that the procurement of these two vehicle types be awarded to Commercial Truck Equipment Co.

Vehicle 4 (heavy duty, flatbed truck with hydraulic dumping) received a highest scoring bid from Commercial Truck Equipment Co. The existing budget value for this vehicle is \$80,000, however the original budget estimate for this truck mistakenly did not incorporate the added cost of a hydraulic dumping bed. Due to this oversight, the bids received from all proponents were considerably higher than anticipated. The highest scoring proposal (i.e. Commercial Truck Equipment Co.) met all of the mandatory requirements as well as meeting or exceeding additional optional specifications including power specifications that will allow for the towing of the excavator. Staff recommend that the procurement of this vehicle be awarded to Commercial Truck Equipment Co.

Although meeting the specifications outlined in the RFP, the sole bids received by South Coast Ford for the fully electric passenger vehicles (vehicles 5 and 6) were almost 20% above budgeted funding. In addition, the vehicle model type presented in the submission was ineligible for the Incentive for Zero-Emission Vehicles - Federal rebate program. Staff are recommending not to accept and cancel the bids for vehicles 5 and 6.

The following table identifies the total service area budgets and the total value of the vehicle purchase recommendations, along with the approved funding sources.

Service Area	Available	Vehicle(s)	Total Budget	Funding	
	Vehicle	Total	Balance	Source	
	Budget Total				
Bylaw Enforcement [210]	\$50,000	\$38,082	\$11,918	Capital	
				Reserves	
South Pender Harbour [366]	\$80,000	\$84,824	(\$4,824)	MFA-5 Year	
				Loan	
Regional Water [370]	*\$300,000	**\$238,245	\$61,755	MFA-5 Year	
				Loan	

* \$80,000+\$80,000+\$50,000+ \$46,500 + \$46,500 = \$300,000

**Vehicles 1, 3 and 4

As identified in Table 2 and discussed above, Staff recommend utilizing existing pooled vehicle funding budgets (i.e. \$300,000 in total) in order to make a purchase decision at this time for several of the vehicles for the RWSA as part of this RFP.

Following this report and the recommended award of vehicles, Staff will review the remaining RWSA vehicle budget balance and will consider available options in order to procure the remaining two (2) fully electric passenger vehicles, including options such as purchasing lightly used vehicles, a review of 2022 budgeted vehicles purchases and/or future (i.e. 2023) budget proposals requesting additional funding.

Timeline for next steps or estimated completion date

South Coast Ford has committed to a 180-day delivery timeline for the vehicles from the SCRD's acceptance of their tender and issuance date of the purchase order.

Commercial Truck Equipment Co. has committed to a 180-day supply and delivery timeline for the chassis of vehicles 2 and 3 and a 240-day delivery timeline for vehicle 4, from the SCRD's acceptance of their tender and issuance date of the purchase order.

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This recommendation is consistent with Section 4.10 Capital Maintenance and Replacement of the Financial Sustainability Policy by addressing the need to replace assets when required to avoid costly repairs and interruption in service.

CONCLUSION

The Bylaw Enforcement, South Pender Harbour, and Regional Water Service Areas identified the purchase of seven (7) new vehicles as part of the 2020 and 2021 Budget process. An RFP was published on December 24, 2021 and closed on January 26, 2022.

Two compliant submissions were received and Staff recommend that a purchase contract be awarded to both South Coast Ford and Commercial Truck Equipment Co. as they met the specifications as outlined and are the highest scoring proponent best value for the abovementioned purchases.

As identified in Table 1, vehicles 1 and 7 received bids that met specifications and had proposal values that were under budget. Staff recommend that the supply and delivery of these two (2) vehicles be awarded to South Coast Ford in the amount of \$86,214 (including PST, excluding GST).

Vehicles 2, 3 and 4 received highest scoring bids from Commercial Truck Equipment Co. The submission values received for these vehicles exceeded existing individual vehicle budgets however due to the overall quality of the proposals, Staff recommend that the supply and delivery of these three vehicles be awarded to Commercial Truck Equipment Co. in the amount of \$274,937 (including PST, excluding GST).

Total available budgeted funds within the Bylaw Enforcement, SPHWSA and RWSA are adequate to fund the recommended vehicle purchases and Staff are recommending that further options be explored to facilitate the purchase (and funding) of the remaining two (2) fully electric passenger vehicles that were not able to be awarded as part of this RFP.

Reviewed by:								
Manager	X - S. Walkey	Finance	X - T. Perreault					
GM	X - R. Rosenboom	Purchasing	X - V Cropp					
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Other						

SUNSHINE COAST REGIONAL DISTRICT- STAFF REPORT

TO: Infrastructure Services Committee – March 10, 2022

AUTHOR: Dean McKinley, Chief Administrative Officer

SUBJECT: CONNECTED COAST INTERNET CONNECTIVITY OPPORTUNITY

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the report titled Connected Coast Internet Connectivity Opportunity be received for information;

AND THAT the Sunshine Coast Regional District support the Connected Coast project in principle;

AND THAT the Sunshine Coast Regional District approve the 10% contribution in principle toward the Connected Coast Internet Connectivity Opportunity to be funded through Electoral Area Community Works Gas Tax Funds (up to \$45,278 from area A to support Earl's Cove/Egmont and up to \$314,429 from area F to support Gambier and Keats islands);

AND THAT staff continue to work with project partners and the residents from Earls Cove/Egmont, Keats Island and Gambier Island to determine desire for project participation;

AND FURTHER THAT a report be brought back to a Corporate and Administrative Service Committee in Q2 of 2022 with an update on community interest and detailed project plan in coordination with the 2023-2027 Financial Planning process.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to secure the possible grant funding eligibility for the Connected Coast Project for Egmont/Earls Cover, Keats Island and Gambier Island as this work continues. In order to secure the grant funding, Northern Development (the administration partner for the Connecting BC program) requires, as a condition of eligibility to receive the grant, resolutions of support for the Connected Coast project and the 10% community contributions. The Strathcona Regional District and Northern Development have confirmed that these resolutions are required as soon as possible. It is important to note that providing these resolutions of support does not commit the SCRD to utilizing these funds unless the project ultimately proceeds. As the requirement for these resolutions is time sensitive, this report is being provided at the Infrastructure Services meeting instead of the Corporate and Administrative Services meeting, where it would typically belong.

The Project

The Connected Coast project is planned to bring new and improved high speed internet accessibility to 154 rural and remote coastal communities, including 51 Indigenous communities representing 44 First Nations along the BC coast from north of Prince Rupert to Haida Gwaii, south to Victoria and around Vancouver Island, with approximately 3,400 km of subsea fibre optic cable. In total, the project has a goal of serving up to 175,000 British Columbians, living in 90,000 households.

Access to reliable high-speed internet and cell phone service means that residents in selected rural areas and coastal islands could have more reliable access to online education, health services, emergency notifications and participate in online information sharing. It could also open new economic development opportunities for residents who would be able to work remotely and participate in e-commerce and online business development regardless of their geographic location.

The Project Partners

The project ownership, operation and management of the Connected Coast project is a joint venture partnership between CityWest Management Corporation (CWMC) a wholly owned subsidiary of the City of Prince Rupert, and the Strathcona Connected Coast Network Corporation (SCCNC), a wholly owned subsidiary of the Strathcona Regional District. The two organizations have combined their funding resources from the Connect to Innovate program realizing that increased benefits for both project areas could be obtained by connecting the two networks. By providing links from Northern BC, and around Vancouver Island to the Vancouver Internet Exchange VIE, the infrastructure would provide internet connectivity to dozens of British Columbian communities and increase system stability, reliability, and resilience by providing an alternate (redundant) route for service as well as achieve economies of scale.

Sites within the SCRD

The Connected Coast network currently includes 15 landing sites within the Sunshine Coast Regional District (Gambier Island, Earls Cove, Secret Cove, Sechelt, Gibsons, Halfmoon Bay, Welcome Beach, Wilson Creek, Roberts Creek, Langdale, Williamson landing, New Brighton, Snug Cove, Egmont, and Pope landing). Several landing locations on the Connected Coast network were planned solely to provide service to anchor institutions as well as to provide an interconnection with existing carriers for the purpose of improving resiliency. Accordingly, there are no plans for last mile development on Sechelt, Gibsons, Langdale, Williamson Landing, Wilson Creek, Snug Cove, Roberts Creek, Pope landing, Welcome Beach, Halfmoon Bay and Secret Cove, as they are considered served communities already receiving the minimum 50/10 broadband speed.

In 2018 the Canadian Radio and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) determined that broadband infrastructure is essential for Canadians to participate in the digital economy and set new targets for internet speeds. The CRTC's new benchmark for broadband speeds for all Canadian homes and businesses is to be at least 50 Mbps for download and 10 Mbps for upload speeds. This change in policy and funding availability has made a number of communities on the Connected Coast network now eligible. Specifically, within the Sunshine Coast Regional District, based on the broadband benchmarks there are currently four communities eligible for funding for last mile infrastructure, (Earls Cove, Egmont, Keats Island and Gambier Island). The table below shows the areas eligible for grant funding, the number of homes potentially served and the funding sources. The amounts identified include capital infrastructure costs to provide fibre to the home solutions for areas. These costs are desktop estimates, and the Connected Coast project team states "We will be working to identify ways to bring the costing down to ensure we are providing the fasted, most desired services at the lowest possible cost".

Almost all Provincial, Federal and CityWest funding is confirmed at this point.

Area	Homes	Total Project costs	Provincial contribution	Federal contribution	CityWest contribution	SCRD Community contribution
Earls Cove/Egmont	66*	\$452,787	\$96,902**	\$193,806	\$116,800	\$45,278
Keats Island	322	\$1,512,047	\$298,518	\$597,036	\$465,288	\$151,205
Gambier Island	341	\$1,632,238	\$323,875	\$647,750	\$497,389	\$163,224

*Discussion with Doug Anastos at Telus indicates that Telus PureFibre is now be available for Earls Cove/Egmont, however, we are unable to confirm that all 66 potential residences identified as being eligible to receive grant funding are within this newly upgraded area. **This provincial funding is awaiting final confirmation

The breakdown of costs for each site includes the supply of materials and labour for a fibre to the home solution.

Where a small number of home(s) are in isolated areas, the cost of a fibre to the home only solution will not be acceptable to the funders and therefore a hybrid solution of fibre and fixed wireless technology will be developed where costs to certain areas are financially prohibitive.

DISCUSSION

The resolutions of support in the recommendations section of the report are a requirement of the funders for the connected Coast Project. Providing the resolutions ensures that should the project ultimately proceed, the grant funding will be available. As there is currently no service set up within the SCRD for provision of internet services, there is no ability or authority to tax residents for the community contribution. Community Works funds, however, are eligible to be used for the community contribution.

There are two options available at this time:

- 1. Provide the resolutions of support. This secures the grant funding potential and does not obligate SCRD to expend the funds unless the project proceeds. Staff recommend this option.
- 2. Do not provide the resolutions. This would essentially end SCRD participation in the Connected Coast project as there would be no possibility of using the grant funds that have been secured for the project.

LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS

If this initiative was pursued, the SCRD may be required to establish a new service. A feasibility function would need to be established to fund the process for a new service. The general process for establishing any new service is as follows:



Once the idea has been raised, the following steps are then required:

• Feasibility Study/Consideration of service decisions

- > Define service area, service level and proposed annual budget
- > Define the boundaries of the service
- Identify the participants of the service
- Determine the method of cost recovery
- Calculate tax rate (should be sufficient to ensure amendment isn't required for at least five years)
- Public consultation via online survey/information sessions to determine community support
- > Staff report to Board summarizing community response
- Develop/Draft bylaw
 - Bylaw must receive 3 readings and be approved by the Inspector of Municipalities prior to commencing the decided upon elector approval process (Assent Vote or Alternative Approval Process)
- Prepare for and initiate the elector approval process
- If elector approval obtained bylaw adoption and submission to Province
- Information to BC Assessment for service area coding

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are several options to possibly fund this project. Generally, this is determined as part of the feasibility, and due to the nature of timing, funding commitment is required immediately. One option could be taxation, however, the Community Works Fund gas tax allows for broadband connectivity as an eligible project. If this source was chosen, the following contributions would be required:

Earl's Cove/Egmont (Area 'A') - \$45,278 Current uncommitted amount available for area 'A' is \$126,263

Keats Island (Area 'F'): \$151,206 Gambier Island (Area 'F'): \$163,224 Current uncommitted amount available for area 'F' is \$932,551

The uncommitted balances for each area is highlighted in yellow below. As the table demonstrates, Area 'A' has a lot of projects/funds already committed. Further, as previously mentioned, it is possible that the homes identified in this area now have access to Telus PureFibre.

There are also some outstanding feasibility projects sitting 'on hold' with Gas tax which staff are working to reconcile which could further impact the amounts of gas tax funding available. The Gas Tax update will be provided at the April 2022 Corporate and Administrative Services Committee with estimated contributions and Census Data for each electoral area.

					_		F					Tatal
	-	A	-	В	-	U		E		1		Total
Function		<u>Z10159</u>		<u>Z10160</u>		<u>Z10161</u>		Z10162		<u>Z10163</u>		
							_					
	\$	1,743,111	\$	1,280,336	\$	1,714,891	\$	2,074,431	\$	1,103,146	\$	7,915,914
	\$	1,743,112	\$	1,280,335	\$	1,714,891	\$	2,074,431	\$	1,103,145	\$	7,915,914
365		20,000										20,000
365		125,000										125,000
366		38,581										38,581
366		108,000										108,000
366		20,268										20,268
366		540,000										540,000
365		765,000										765,000
650				47,274								47,274
650				300,000								300,000
384				2,661								2,661
385				2,985								2,985
392												-
382								9,502				9,502
370										44,594		44,594
										126,000		126,000
_	\$	1,616,849	\$	352,920	\$	-	\$	9,502	\$	170,594	\$	2,149,865
	\$	126,263	\$	927,415	\$	1,714,891	\$	2,064,929	\$	932,551	\$	5,766,049
		18.12%		18.83%		23.63%		25.31%		14.11%		100.00%
	Function	Function S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	A Function Z10159 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,25,000 \$ 1,25,000 \$ 125,000 \$ 126,000 \$ 126,000 \$ 126,000 \$ 126,000 \$ 5,500 \$ 166 \$ 16,649 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 126,263 \$ 126,263	A Function Z10159 \$ 1,743,111 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ \$ 365 20,000 366 38,581 366 125,000 366 38,581 366 540,000 366 540,000 365 765,000 650 650 651 384 385 392 370 \$ \$ 1,616,849 \$ \$ 1,616,849 \$ \$ 1,616,849 \$	A B Function Z10159 Z10160 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 366 20,000 366 20,208 366 20,268 366 540,000 365 765,000 47,274 40,000 384 2,661 385 2,985 370 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 362,920 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 362,920 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 362,920	A B Function Z10159 Z10160 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,335 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ \$ 365 20,000 \$ 366 38,581 \$ 366 125,000 \$ 366 20,268 \$ 366 540,000 \$ 365 765,000 \$ 650 \$ 300,000 \$ 384 2,661 \$ 385 2,985 \$ 382 \$ \$ 370 \$ \$ \$ 1,616,849 \$ 362,920 \$ \$ 126,263 \$ 927,415 \$	A B D Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 366 20,000 366 366 125,000 366 366 20,268 366 366 20,268 366 366 20,268 300,000 366 540,000 47,274 385 2,985 330,000 384 2,661 330,000 385 370 47,274 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 352,920 - \$ 1,616,849 \$ 352,920 - \$ 1,616,849 \$ 352,920 - \$ 1,616,849 \$ 362,920 -	A B D Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ \$ 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 20,026 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 366 300,000 \$ 300,000 \$ 1,81,274 \$ 1,81,274 \$ 1,81,274 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,714,891 384 2,661 \$ 2,985 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 1,714,891 382	A B D E Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 Z10162 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ 365 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 20,000 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 366 300,000 \$ 362 \$ 300,000 \$ 363 366 540,000 \$ 300,000 \$ 9,502 \$ 9,502 382 \$ 2,985 \$ 9,502 \$ 9,502 382 \$ 1,616,849 \$ 352,920 \$	A B D E Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 Z10162 \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ 1,743,111 \$ 1,280,336 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ 1,743,112 \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ 1,280,335 \$ 1,714,891 \$ 2,074,431 \$ \$ \$ \$ <	A B D E F Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 Z10162 Z10163 S 1,743,111 S 1,280,336 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,146 S 1,743,111 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,146 S 1,743,112 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 S 1,743,112 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 366 20,000 1,03,145 366 125,000 1,03,145 366 125,000 1,03,145	A B D E F Function Z10159 Z10160 Z10161 Z10162 Z10163 S 1,743,111 S 1,280,336 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,146 S S 1,743,111 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,146 S S 1,743,112 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 S 366 20,000 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 S 366 105,000 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 S 366 125,000 S 1,280,335 S 1,714,891 S 2,074,431 S 1,103,145 S 366 20,000 S 365 1,25,000 S

STRATEGIC PLAN AND RELATED POLICIES

This project does not specifically align with any of the SCRD Board Strategic Plan Focus Areas.

CONCLUSION

The resolutions of support in the recommendations section of the report are a requirement of the funders for the connected Coast Project. Staff recommend providing these resolutions. This secures the grant funding potential and does not obligate SCRD to expend the funds unless the project proceeds.

Reviewed b	y:		
Manager		Finance	X - T. Perreault
GM		Legislative	X - S. Reid
CAO	X - D. McKinley	Other	