



# COLUMBIA SHUSWAP REGIONAL DISTRICT

## Electoral Area Directors' Committee Meeting

### AGENDA

**Date:** Tuesday, January 9, 2024  
**Time:** 9:30 AM  
**Location:** CSRD Boardroom  
555 Harbourfront Drive NE, Salmon Arm

Pages

#### 1. Land Acknowledgement

We acknowledge that we are meeting in service to the Columbia Shuswap Regional District which is on the traditional and unceded territories of the Secwepemc, Syilx Okanagan, Sinixt and Ktunaxa Nation. We are privileged and grateful to be able to live, work and play in this beautiful area.

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act  
Article 29:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands or territories and resources. States shall establish and implement assistance programmes for indigenous peoples for such conservation and protection, without discrimination.
2. States shall take effective measures to ensure that no storage or disposal of hazardous materials shall take place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples without their free, prior and informed consent.
3. States shall also take effective measures to ensure, as needed, that programmes for monitoring, maintaining and restoring the health of indigenous peoples, as developed and implemented by the peoples affected by such materials, are duly implemented.

#### 2. Call to Order

#### 3. Inaugural Proceedings

3.1 Election of Chair

3.2 Election of Vice Chair

#### 4. Adoption of Agenda

##### Motion

THAT: the Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting agenda be approved.

#### 5. Meeting Minutes

##### 5.1 Adoption of Minutes 1

##### Motion

THAT: the minutes of the November 28, 2023 Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting be adopted.

#### 6. Reports by Staff

None.

#### 7. Reports by Electoral Area Directors

##### 7.1 Community Infrastructure 6

Request from Director Simpson

##### Motion

THAT: the Committee request the Board create a committee of EAD Directors and CSRD staff to discuss and identify a course of action to support Electoral Areas achieve their community infrastructure goals.

##### 7.2 Planning Policy Comparison 7

Request from Director Simpson

##### Motion

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board request staff prepare a report that compares and contrasts the planning process for a single-family residence in Scotch Creek to a similar structure in comparable regional districts, such as the TNRD.

##### 7.3 Community Interface Wildfire Training 15

Request from Director Simpson

##### Motion

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board provide the opportunity to interested individuals in electoral areas to take training on wildfire fighting, with the minimum training at a S-100 level.

##### 7.4 Reduction of Tipping and Planning Fees for Uninsured Residents 16

Request from Director Simpson

**Motion**

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board waive tipping fees and planning fees for identified uninsured individuals suffering loss from the Bush Creek East Wildfire.

**7.5 BC Hydro Regreening Grant Support Request**

17

Request from Director Simpson

**Motion**

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board direct staff to provide GIS support, grant filing and other assistance to support the Shuswap Economic Development Society in the preparation and submission of a BC Hydro Regreening grant.

**8. Adjournment**

**Motion**

THAT: the Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting be adjourned.



## ELECTORAL AREA DIRECTORS' COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

**Note: The following minutes are subject to correction when endorsed by the Committee at the next Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting.**

**Date:** November 28, 2023  
**Time:** 9:30 AM  
**Location:** CSRD Boardroom  
 555 Harbourfront Drive NE, Salmon Arm

Directors Present	K. Cathcart^ (Vice Chair) D. Brooks-Hill^ D. Trumbley R. Martin J. Simpson (Chair) N. Melnychuk M. McCormick	Electoral Area A Director Electoral Area B Director Electoral Area D Director Electoral Area E Director Electoral Area F Director Electoral Area G Director Electoral Area C Alternate Director
Directors Absent	M. Gibbons	Electoral Area C Director
Staff in Attendance	J. MacLean J. Sham  C. Robichaud G. Christie  C. Paiement* J. Pierce  B. Van Nostrand*  T. Perepolkin* G. Cockburn C. Smit*	Chief Administrative Officer General Manager, Corporate Services (Corporate Officer) Deputy Corporate Officer General Manager, Development Services Manager, Planning Services General Manager, Financial Services (Chief Financial Officer) Acting General Manager, Environmental and Utility Services Manager, Utility Services Asset Management Coordinator Senior Bylaw Enforcement Officer

\*attended a portion of the meeting only

^electronic participation

**1. Land Acknowledgement**

We acknowledge that we are meeting in service to the Columbia Shuswap Regional District which is on the traditional and unceded territories of the Secwepemc, Syilx Okanagan, Sinixt and Ktunaxa Nation. We are privileged and grateful to be able to live, work and play in this beautiful area.

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act

Article 26:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired.

2. Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.

3. States shall give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories and resources. Such recognition shall be conducted with due respect to the customs, traditions and land tenure systems of the indigenous peoples concerned.

**2. Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:33 AM.

**3. Adoption of Agenda**

**Moved By** Director Cathcart

**Seconded By** Director Melnychuk

THAT: the agenda of Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting be approved.

**CARRIED**

**4. Meeting Minutes**

**4.1 Adoption of Minutes**

**Moved By** Director Melnychuk

**Seconded By** Director Trumbley

THAT: the minutes of the May 2, 2023 Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting be adopted.

**CARRIED**

Director Martin joined the meeting at 9:34 AM.

## 5. Reports by Staff

### 5.1 Grant-in-Aids Discussion

General Manager Pierce asked the EA Directors to consider transitioning to a quarterly system for the Grant-in-Aid (GIA) program that would have a provision for emergency situations. She said the current monthly model was burdensome to staff and not efficient.

Directors who were supportive of testing out a quarterly system on a trial basis starting in 2024 as the new proposed system would be the same as other grant funding sources.

Directors opposed to the proposed change felt that there would be timing and communication issues changing funding to a quarterly model and suggested that staff consider altering the current automated process to better meet the needs of applicants, elected officials, and staff.

**Moved By** Director Trumbley

**Seconded By** Director Melnychuk

THAT: the Committee recommend to the Board that the Grant In Aid grant funding move to a quarterly model on a trial basis for 2024.

**DEFEATED**

**In Favour – Directors Trumbley and Melnychuk**

**Opposed – Directors Cathcart, Brooks-Hill, Simpson, Martin and Alternate Director McCormick**

### 5.2 Asset Management - Water Systems

Greg Cockburn, Asset Management Coordinator provided a presentation to the Committee.

### 5.3 Compliance and Enforcement Response Options Regarding Non-Compliant Buoys

Request from Director Melnychuk

Late Agenda - updated presentation attached.

**Moved By** Director Martin

**Seconded By** Director Cathcart

THAT: the Committee recommend to the Board direct staff to explore options to raise priority levels in the bylaw enforcement process regarding water utilities under the drinking water protection act;

AND THAT: staff bring back the options to a future EAD Committee meeting.

**CARRIED**

**Moved By** Director Martin  
**Seconded By** Director Trumbley

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board prepare a resolution for SILGA, UBCM, and FCM regarding non-enforcement of docks and buoys by the provincial government.

**CARRIED**

The Committee took a break at 11:43 AM and the meeting resumed at 11:51 AM.

**5.4 Water Quality Concerns: Emergency Response, Compliance and Enforcement**

Report from Tim Perepolkin, Manager, Utility Services, dated November 16, 2023.

Discussion:

The Committee discussed private water users and ways the CSRD could communicate with the private utility owners and residents about water quality concerns.

The use of Alertable was considered for private system water concern notifications, however, expressed CAO caution as an uptick of perpetual notifications from Alertable could be regarded as false alerts by the public.

**Moved By** Director Melnychuk  
**Seconded By** Director Martin

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board direct CSRD staff to explore options and present the Board with an improved communications protocol regarding drinking water risks.

**CARRIED**

**Moved By** Director Melnychuk  
**Seconded By** Director Martin

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board direct CSRD staff to explore options for communication regarding Carmel Beach Resort wastewater system.

**CARRIED**

**Moved By** Director Melnychuk  
**Seconded By** Alternate Director McCormick

THAT: the Committee recommend the Board request the Ministry of Environment make a presentation at a future Board meeting regarding source water protection, spills and discharges.

**CARRIED**

**6. Reports by Electoral Area Directors**

**6.1 Solutions for Childcare in Rural Areas**

EA Directors request from the August 17, 2023 Regular Board meeting.

Discussion:

The Committee discussed challenges with childcare in rural communities and the lack of local government owned land to build facilities for the betterment of the community.

Directors asked staff if funds or land acquired during the subdivision process could be utilized for childcare facilities. General Manager Development Services confirmed that under legislation the land or payment in lieu funds obtained through a subdivision process must be used for parkland.

The CAO stated that a community amenity service establishment could be explored, however, it would need to be presented and approved by the electorate through an assent vote for taxation of a new service establishment.

**7. Adjournment**

**Moved By** Director Melnychuk  
**Seconded By** Director Trumbley

THAT: the Electoral Area Directors' Committee meeting be adjourned.

**CARRIED**

11:52 PM

---

CORPORATE OFFICER

---

CHAIR





## Request for EAD Meeting Business Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Community Infrastructure Originally submitted for the May 1, 2023 EAD meeting.
<b>REQUEST BY:</b>	Jay Simpson
<b>DESCRIPTION/ CONTEXT:</b>	Electoral Areas that do not have a municipality either in them, or immediately beside them, have a dearth of community infrastructure. I'm thinking of things like a community centre, where there might be day-care, library, a civic hall, skating rink, seniors housing, activity centre with a gym, food hub. When thinking of the community of 2040, just 15 or so years from now, these items will be a must-have not just a nice-to-have.
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	<p>As Electoral Areas, not incorporated municipalities, we have a significant shortfall of grants that can be applied to community infrastructure. I look at Chase or Sicamous, both with significantly smaller populations, and they have arenas, curling rinks, skateboard parks, and many pieces of publicly funded amenities.</p> <p>As I understand it, the CSRD may be able to apply for similar grants, but would only receive one grant, and of course there are now 7 areas that would be interested in receiving the benefits of that grant. And of course there would be staff time to a) write the grant application b) administer the grant. And there would be the funds that we would have to put up, hopefully not matching funds but certainly our share.</p> <p>The CSRD owns and operates Arenas in both Golden and Sicamous, so the CSRD owning facilities is not unheard of.</p> <p>So how do we as simple Electoral Areas begin to plan to provide some of these opportunities to our future residents?</p>
<b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b>	Motion: That the EAD committee request that the CSRD board strike a committee of EAD Directors and CSRD staff to discuss and identify a path towards Electoral Areas achieving their goals of community infrastructure.



## Request for EAD Meeting Business Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Comparison of planning policies between Regional Districts
<b>REQUEST BY:</b>	Jay Simpson
<b>DESCRIPTION/ CONTEXT:</b>	<p>The planning and permitting process in the CSR D is difficult to navigate, expensive, and time consuming. I hear numerous stories over the years of people and businesses pulling up stakes and moving due to the frustration of our process.</p> <p>I'm under the impression that planning in neighbouring RD's is significantly easier.</p>
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	<p>There is a local engineer who is significantly involved in development in the CSR D and other adjoining Regional Districts, and who handles developments of residences, large development, waterfront retaining walls and more.</p> <p>A couple of years ago he compared planning processes between the CSR D and the TNRD in terms of ease of permits, costs, time spent etc. You'll find this report attached.</p> <p>At the time I received this I brought it to the attention of the, then, CAO. It was not received well and went no further.</p> <p>I would like to bring this report to the attention of our Electoral Area Directors as it is our people in the zoned EA's that must deal with this every day.</p> <p>I think it would be worthwhile to have a current report done to determine the differences today, and if the report shows similar permit differences, outline a path to streamlining the CSR D processes so that our residents and businesses are not hindered by these overly complex processes and policies.</p>
<b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b>	<p>Motion: That the EAD committee recommend to the CSR D Board to have staff prepare a report that compares and contrasts the planning process for a single family residence in Scotch Creek to a similar structure in the TNRD.</p>

This email was regarding requiring park model homes in a North Shuswap recreational development, Gateway Falls, to be seasonal only.

**From:** Dan Postma <[dpostma1966@gmail.com](mailto:dpostma1966@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** May 31, 2021 3:25 PM

**To:** Director Simpson <[JSimpson@csrd.bc.ca](mailto:JSimpson@csrd.bc.ca)>

**Subject:** Scared to death!

Dear Jay

My husband and I have been members of this community for 17 years. Our 2 daughters and 3 granddaughters have grown on the Shuswap lake. We chose to move here because of our own childhood memories. I read your bio, we understand your love for the area. You are the first of many people I have to contact, as my home, and financial future seem to be at risk.

For 17 years my husband and I have renovated, built and helped many people in this community. We believe in shopping local and much as possible. The majority of building products and groceries, not to mention entertainment items....have been purchased here to support local businesses.

Now, our future is being threatened by the very people who are suppose to protect us.

It appears that the CSRD is taking a stand that is going to displace many young, middle aged and senior people from their homes. In a time where we have all been through a pandemic that has effected us and many financially, I find this heartless. When housing is unattainable by many, this seems careless. When seniors need inexpensive housing, disgusting!

Here it is: We live in a park model and have for 17 years. It is located in a park that has excellent sewer and water services, garbage collection and taxes! Why in the world would the CSRD now try to kick people out of their forever homes, or try to dictate the sale and living terms? We sunk all we had into this place with the belief we would be able to sell on the same terms we purchased. We have slowly had many of our amenities taken away. Nothing has been given to improve those losses.

We live in Gateway. We are saddened that our people...Jay Samson, who we voted for, has become our enemy.

So, what are we to do from here on? You want us all to move our park models to abandoned lots?, to empty streets? Live in tents in community parks? Those people seem to have more rights than tax paying, registered voting residents of Gateway.

My plea: stop the threats and pulling the rug out from under us. We are here, have been for 20 years. Keep the blood off of your hands. Step up and do something positive for us please!

20% of us live here fulltime, supporting this community. No one has every mentioned full time living. Matter fact, we have sat at the same table, with you, at the Hub because we are part of this community!

Please help me understand why the CSRD is set on displacing so many of us.

Thanks. I hope you took the time to read this whole message. Regardless, you will be hearing from us one way or another.

Thanks

Dan and Heather Postma

#2 Gateway

This email was received by us in early December from the same people.

----- Forwarded message -----  
 From: **Dan** <[dpostma1966@gmail.com](mailto:dpostma1966@gmail.com)>  
 Date: Tue, Dec 5, 2023, 6:00 a.m.  
 Subject: Rezoning  
 To: <[edward.riley@live.ca](mailto:edward.riley@live.ca)>

Attention CSRD directors.

It is with great sadness and concern that I write this letter to you.

Our names are Dan and Heather Postma, owners of lot #2 in Gateway Lakeview Resort.

My wife and I moved to the Shuswap in 2005 to slow life down and enjoy the lake life. We purchased our lot in Gateway hoping to live a smaller, more comfortable life with the hopes of investing our money and time into an exciting new development, which offered pool, restaurant, lake access and an exciting future of a beautiful resort lifestyle.

My wife Heather, and I have been in the building industry since 1984. We have dealt with many regional districts, municipalities and cities for permits and development. We have never dealt with a more difficult, un cooperative regional district as the Shuswap.

My story starts when we purchased our park model and applied for a building permit for our addition in 2005. We were met with unreasonable requests and an inspector that had no sense of reason. The process at that time put my wife and I through a lot of strain and stress just trying to accommodate the unreasonable process that was put before us.

As the years went on, our development has come up against numerous blockades, put on by the CSRD. Permits were issued then revoked. Promises made by leaders and directors of the CSRD...revoked. Meeting after meeting after meeting all to no avail to have our development stalled once again.

Also, as years went on, we have lost everything that was promised to us...club house, swimming pool, lake access, restaurant...etc.

Here we are in 2023, 18 years and our development sits stagnant through no fault of our own! We have lost thousands of dollars in our investment as a result of the regional districts restraints and unreasonable requests put on to our development.

Now sits an unfinished resort, and in many views, an eye sore as buildings sit empty and deteriorate further.

It seems to me that directors of the CSRD have ulterior motives and are either swayed by local "haters" or are being paid to sway their decisions against us.

This is a disgusting display of civil servants quashing development on the north shore for some agenda that doesn't make any sense.

In a time of housing shortages and cost of living sky rocketing, the CSRD has contributed to the problem in asking Gateway Lakeview Resort to be a seasonal use only resort.

We have had our place on the market for over two years without any offers as a result of the rezoning put on by the CSRD.

Therefore, I am removing my support from the developer who misled us in discussions of the future of the development, and call on the CSRD to reinstate the original application of Gateway Lakeview Resort.

As I stated above, I have never seen a development take 20 years to move forward.

You should be embarrassed for your lack of commitment to the people of this community and embarrassed for the way you have handled our requests for a development that could have been beautifully finished and an asset to the north shore.

I am saddened that the present and past owners of Gateway Lakeview Resort have been labeled "outsiders" in this community, even though many of us have been here for more than 20 years. We have seen many of our friends come and go from here, leaving with a saddened sense of loss, as investments and promises have been revoked.  
SHAME ON YOU.

## The costs of being in the CSRD

This is a comparison of the process of building a 3,500 ft<sup>2</sup> rancher style, waterfront home in Scotch Creek on a 13,000 ft<sup>2</sup> lot (approximately 75 feet by 173 feet) with what someone would face building the same home in our regional district to the west.

This is a rough estimate in the spreadsheet. Details follow. Please note these costs are somewhat variable depending on circumstances

### Costs of planning

CSRD			CSRD cost		
Bylaw	Description		Best Case	Worst	
644	Development Approval Info	survey, arch review etc	1500	5000	or more
825	SC/LC Zoning bylaw	rezone if outside of restrictions	1500	1500	1 year +
830	NS Official Community Plan	DP	350	350	
		Hazardous lands DP			
		Flooding and Debris DP	2500	2500	
		Steep slope DP > 30%	3000	10000	
		Interface fire DP	0	0	wow
900		Foreshore & water DP	650	650	
		Lakes 100m DP (septic)	2000	2000	
		Riparian Areas regulations	2000	2000	
630	Building Regulations	lot survey	700	700	
			<u>14200</u>	<u>24700</u>	And maybe more
TNRD					
		Less restrictive requirements			
2400	Zoning		0		
2066	Building regulations	survey	700	700	
		riparian	2000	2000	
		arch etc if needed		5000	
		septic - IH design	500	500	
			<u>3200</u>	<u>8200</u>	

Not to mention the time and frustration factors.

**More Details....**

**Anyone building in Scotch Creek faces the following list of regulations.**

1. Bylaw 644 – Development Approval Information

This is the bylaw that requires an applicant to fill out a Preliminary Project Impact Assessment Form that duplicates most of the information required in the Development Permit application. It also allows the regional district ask for a detailed survey of the property carried out by a Land Surveyor (\$1,500 - \$2,000), can invoke an archaeological review (best case \$2,500) if you are in an area with high archaeological potential, and assess impacts on transportation, natural environment, the agricultural land reserve, ...and on and on.

2. Bylaw 825 – Scotch Creek/Lee Creek Zoning Bylaw

The example being used has greater than 25% lot coverage so a full rezoning is required. The application will cost \$1,500 and the process will take between 12 and 18 months. This will involve advertising, a referral to all agencies; Highways, Interior Health, Ministry of Forests, etc. which often involves additional costs. It will also include a full public hearing and require a final decision by the board.

3. Bylaw 830 – North Shuswap Official Community Plan

The cost to apply for a development permit is \$350 but there are other associated costs.

3.1. Hazardous Lands Development Permit Area 1

3.2. DPA 1 – Flooding and Debris Flow Potential DP

If the lot is west of Squilax Anglemont and Wharf Roads, a surface water hydrology report is required at a typical cost of \$2,500. A covenant will also have to be registered on title “saving the regional district and the province Harmless” in the event of property damage. This will cost a further \$2,000 in legal fees and registration costs at the Land Title Office.

3.3. DPA 2 – Steep Slope DP

If any portion of the lot has a slope of greater than 30%, this will require a report from a professional engineer carried out under the Legislated Landslide Regulations and could cost between \$3,000 and \$10,000. Despite the wording in the bylaw, the regional district is accepting a BC Building Code Schedule B from an professional engineer to cover this requirement.

3.4. DPA 3 – Interface Fire DP

This is the easy one. Agree to follow the Fire Smart recommendations for building your new house and this is waived.

### 3.5. DPA 4 – Foreshore and Water DP

If you want a new dock or to install a mooring buoy, you need to apply for this development permit. The rules are contained in yet another bylaw, Bylaw 900 – Lakes Bylaw. This lot would be entitled to one mooring buoy and one maximum 24 m<sup>2</sup> dock. The dock will need provincial approval first which takes 3 to 6 months to get.

If you want a bigger dock, you first need to get provincial approval. You then need to apply for Development Variance Permit at a cost of \$650 that will take another 6 months. At the end of this process, the board will decide if they will approve the larger dock or not.

### 4. DPA 5 – Lakes 100 m DP

All new homes will require either connecting to an existing septic system or most likely building a new one. This permit requires that all work be done by a professional engineer (even in cases where provincial legislation will allow a less expensive practitioner) and a groundwater hydrology report (\$2,000).

### 5. Riparian Areas Regulation DP

Any development within 30 m (100 feet) of the lake requires this development permit that involves getting a Riparian Area Assessment (\$2,000).

At the end of this process, all of the development permits are registered as one document on the title of your property. If you're broke, exhausted, or just need time to recover from what you've gone through, don't stop now. You have 2 years to complete your building or you get to start over with new applications

### 6. Bylaw 630 – Building Regulation

Congratulations, you've now reached the relatively straightforward part of this process. Prepare a full set of building drawings and submit them to the building official. They will tell you where you need professional oversight for things like structural elements not covered in the Building Code or for foundation issues. They will also tell you what the fee is. Pay your fees, submit the Building Code Schedules from the required professionals, and get a permit in a few weeks.

If you are building on a small lot, the building inspector might ask for a location survey before you pour your foundations to make sure all setbacks are correct (\$700).



**The following regulations govern building in our neighbouring regional district to the west.**

1. Bylaw 2400 – Zoning

Unlike the North Shuswap that has 3 separate zoning bylaws and some areas with no zoning, this regional district has one bylaw that covers the entire regional district. Wildfire management is contained in the General Regulations. Floodplain issues, lakeshore development (only applies to rezoning applications), and the Riparian Area Regulation are all contained within their own section of the bylaw. There is no separate application process.

In the example of building a 3,500 ft<sup>2</sup> rancher style, waterfront home on a 13,000 ft<sup>2</sup> lot, maximum site coverage is 40% so no rezoning or other variance is required.

2. Bylaw 2066 – Building Regulations

This process is the same as within our regional district except a building permit application is the only application you need to make.

Prepare a full set of building drawings and submit them to the building official. They will tell you where you need professional oversight for things like structural elements not covered in the Building Code or for foundation issues. They will also tell you what the fee is. Pay your fees, submit the Building Code Schedules from the required professionals, and get a permit in a few weeks. Before you pour your foundation, you may also be asked for a location survey to ensure all setbacks are correct.

If there are works within 30 m of the lake, you will still be required to do a Riparian Area Assessment (\$2,000).

If your building plan shows a direct conflict with a recorded archaeological site (not areas of high potential), you will need to hire an archaeologist and deal with the situation as required by provincial legislation.

For septic disposal, you need to file a design with Interior Health prepared under the BC Sewerage Regulation rules.



# Request for EAD Meeting Business Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Community Interface Fire training
<b>REQUEST BY:</b>	Jay Simpson
<b>DESCRIPTION/ CONTEXT:</b>	During wildfire events, the number of people on the ground to fight the fire is usually far less than is needed. The community of the North Shuswap has requested that a Wildfire Interface training opportunity be provided to civilians in our community.
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	<p>Whether it be a rapid response group that is able to respond rapidly to a lightning strike, or personnel to work with BC Wildfire Service on the front lines of fires in a community, the ability of local personnel with training could be the difference between a community disaster and saving hundreds of homes.</p> <p>During the Bush Creek East fire in the North Shuswap this past summer, BC Wildfire Service showed that they were able to work with local people who were trained to at least a minimal standard of safety.</p> <p>The people of the North Shuswap have asked that S-100 training be provided in the community for those able-bodied individual, who have an interest.</p> <p>I believe there is funding for this from the province, but even if there is not, we will find a way to fund this opportunity.</p>
<b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b>	Motion: That the EAD committee recommend to the CSR Board to provide the opportunity to interested able-bodied people in our Electoral Areas to take training on wildfire fighting, at least to the S-100 level.



## Request for EAD Meeting Business Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Reduction of tipping fees and planning fees for un-insured residents who have suffered total loss of homes and businesses.
<b>REQUEST BY:</b>	Jay Simpson
<b>DESCRIPTION/ CONTEXT:</b>	There are a number of un-insured people identified in the North Shuswap who, in almost all cases, have been wiped out, and are in the lower end of the socioeconomic scales. The CSR D should eliminate tipping fees for fire debris and planning fees for these residents.
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	<p>Through the ESS and North Shuswap Disaster Relief Society, roughly 30 or so people/families have been identified as having unmet needs. They are currently not in their home, or are living in distressed situations (trailers), on their burned out properties.</p> <p>These people typically have very little, in many cases they were living in a park model, mobile home or RV. Their income is one of disability, CPP and/or OAS. They usually owned their trailer and it's contents and have little if anything left. Even if they had jobs, those are often self-employed or service jobs with limited financial opportunities. Some have had their tools or equipment for their self-employed jobs reduced to slag.</p> <p>It is adding significant hardship when asking them to pay for tipping fees which could add up to \$3000+, and permit fees which could add up to thousands more.</p> <p>It would be relatively easy to identify these people at both the transfer stations, land fills, and planning department.</p>
<b>OTHER COMMENTS:</b>	Motion: That the EAD committee recommend to the CSR D Board to waive tipping fees and planning fees for identified uninsured individuals suffering loss from the North Shuswap fire.



## Request for Board Meeting Business Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Originally requested for the Dec. 8 <sup>th</sup> CSR D Board Meeting For action: Board request for staff help and grant submission to BC Hydro for funds from the BC Hydro Regreening fund.
<b>REQUEST BY:</b>	Jay Simpson for the December 8, 2023 board meeting
<b>DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT:</b>	<p>BC Hydro has a Regreening Fund available to municipal and indigenous organizations. The Community ReGreening program supports the planting of trees and other vegetation that help enhance ecological networks across the province. The program also helps to ensure the <u>right trees are planted near their power lines.</u></p> <p>Application intake until January 31, 2024</p> <p>SEDS (Shuswap Economic Development Society) has most of the grant done. Needs some mapping and other minor support from the CSR D. CSR D must make the grant application.</p>
<b>DISCUSSION:</b>	<p>They provide financial support up to \$7,500 per applicant to purchase trees and other vegetation for small-scale community planting projects.</p> <p>They help fund the purchase of plants and shipping costs when appropriate. Applicants are responsible for arranging labour and ongoing maintenance of their project. Grant funding is awarded to the applicant after the successful completion of the project and the final report is approved.</p> <p>EAD motion: That the EAD committee recommend to the CSR D Board that they provide GIS, grant submission and other assistance to Shuswap Economic Development Society in the preparation and submission of a BChydro Regreening grant.</p>

Nov 29, 2024

Jay Simpson  
CSRD Area F Director  
e) [jsimpson@csrd.bc.ca](mailto:jsimpson@csrd.bc.ca)

Director Simpson,

The Environment Subcommittee of the Shuswap Economic Recovery Task Force would like to ask the CSRD to make an application to the BC Hydro Community Regreening Program. We feel this to be a great opportunity to launch an environmentally responsible feel-good campaign that the entire North Shuswap and the Area G communities within the South Shuswap can embrace, which is symbolic of community values, resilience and spirit, and a strong commitment to recovery on behalf of all partners.

### **About the BC Hydro ReGreening Program**

[Community ReGreening program \(bchydro.com\)](https://bchydro.com)

Our Community ReGreening program supports the planting of trees and other vegetation that help enhance ecological networks across the province. The program also helps to ensure the [right trees are planted near our power lines](#).

Our ReGreening grants fund small-scale community planting projects and are open to all municipal and Indigenous Nations' governments within [BC Hydro's service area](#). Our application intake is now open from November 1, 2023, to January 31, 2024.

We provide financial support of up to \$7,500 per applicant to purchase trees and other vegetation for small-scale community planting projects.

We help fund the purchase of plants and shipping costs when appropriate. Applicants are responsible for arranging labour and ongoing maintenance of their project. Grant funding is awarded to the applicant after the successful completion of the project and the final report is approved

Our subcommittee would be available to work with your team to complete the grant application and coordinate community involvement in the program.

### **Next steps subject to approval**

Site plan development

- Expertise to execute site plans- i.e., Certified arborist and horticulturist.
- Basic maps for completion of site plan (detailed landscape site plans are not required).
- Completion of site plans before the snow is an important step.
- Area F and Area G specifically (all work done concerning Fire Smart principals and Geotech reports).

Thank you very much for this consideration.

Barbra Fairclough

604 309 5142

Chair, Environment Subcommittee  
Economic Development Recovery Task Force