PLEASE NOTE:
In accordance with the orders from the Provincial Health Officer regarding COVID-19 and the requirement for physical distancing, this meeting will be conducted by electronic communications only. The meeting will be live-streamed on the District of Sechelt’s YouTube channel.

To attend this meeting by computer, go to https://zoom.us, join Meeting ID 834 6774 2311 and Password: July2020

If you do not have internet access, you can dial-in to the meeting: 1-778-907-2071 with Meeting ID 834 6774 2311 and Password: 50452283. To raise hand by phone during Q&A, dial *9

Questions can be submitted to CouncilMeetings@sechelt.ca, or drop off/mail a letter (2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie St., PO Box. 129, Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A0). As appropriate, answers to questions will be posted within our For the Record page on the District’s website, sechelt.ca.

DISTRICT OF SECHELT
REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL

Via Zoom Online Meeting Platform
Wednesday, July 15, 2020
7:00 pm

AMENDED AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICT
2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
3. APPOINTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS
   3.1 Colin Jacobsen, Suncoast Racquet Club
       • Lease Extension Request

4. PROCLAMATIONS

None.
5. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS**

5.1 Minutes of the 3:30pm Regular Council Meeting of June 10, 2020

5.2 Minutes of the 7:00pm Regular Council Meeting of June 17, 2020

5.3 Minutes of the 3:00pm Special Council Meeting of June 24, 2020

5.4 Minutes of the 3:30pm Regular Council Meeting of July 8, 2020

6. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

7. **COMMITTEE / COMMISSION MINUTES AND REPORTS**

7.1 Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes of June 10, 2020 - For Receipt and Endorsement

7.2 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 7, 2020 – For Receipt

8. **BYLAWS**

For Three Readings & Adoption

8.1 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 593, 2020

(a) Report from Ben Currie, Manager of Financial Services

(b) 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 593, 2020

For Third Reading

8.2 Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018 (Everbrite Ventures)

(a) Report from Ian Holl, Development Planning Manager

(b) Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018 (Everbrite Ventures)

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

None.
10. BUSINESS ITEMS

10.1 Suncoast Racquet Club Lease Renewal  Pg 45 - 49
   • Report from Ben Currie, Manager of Financial Services

10.2 Development Variance Permit Application – Sechelt Fire
     Protection District  Pg 50 - 57
   • Report from Mark Dalaire, Planning Technician

10.3 Engagement Options for Place Name Proposals for Wilson
     Creek  Pg 58 - 60
   • Report from Julie Rogers, Communications Manager

10.4 Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund Committee
     Grant Recommendations  Pg 61 - 101
   • Report from Elise Rudland, Chair of SCCF

10.5 Operations Building Request for Proposal Results  Pg 102 - 120
   • Report from Ben Currie, Manager of Financial Services

10.6 2020 Property Tax Statistics  Pg 121 - 124
   • Report from David Douglas, Director of Financial
     Services

10.7 Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program Performance
     Stage – Hackett Park  Pg 125 - 126
   • Report from David Douglas, Director of Financial
     Services

10.8 Sechelt Downtown Business Association Island Coastal
     Economic Trust Grant – Street Patios  Pg 127 - 134
   • Report from Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer

10.9 BC Infrastructure Planning Grant  Pg 135 - 136
   • Report from David Douglas, Director of Financial
     Services  (to be distributed separately)

10.10 Open Meeting without Public Present Resolution  Pg 137 - 150
   • Report from Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
11. REPORTS FROM COUNCILLORS

11.1 Councillors’ Reports  Verbal

11.2 SCRD Board – Council Representative Report  Verbal

   (a) SCRD Report from Councillor Toth  Pg 151 - 153

12. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING ITEMS

12.1 Council Correspondence – For Receipt  Pg 154 - 179

12.2 RCMP Statistics for January to June, 2020 – For Receipt  Pg 180 - 187

13. MAYOR, COUNCIL AND STAFF EMERGENCY ITEMS

14. ADJOURNMENT

Public Question and Answer Period
Delegation Request
July 15, 2020 – Regular Council Meeting

Colin Jacobsen – Suncoast Racquet Club

Suncoast Racquet Club has requested a one-page addendum to our existing lease with the District, to facilitate the re-financing of our existing loan.

The delegation is to respond to any questions that Council may have regarding the lease extension request letter, attached to the staff report for Business Item 10.1, *Suncoast Racquet Club Lease Renewal*. 
In accordance with the orders from the Provincial Health Officer regarding COVID-19 and the requirements for physical distancing, the June 10, 2020 Regular Council meeting was conducted by remote conferencing.

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICT**

The Mayor called the Regular Council Meeting to order at 3:52 pm.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Res. No. 2020-06B-1 – Moved/Seconded

That the agenda be amended by adding *Business Item 3.1, Request for Noise Bylaw No. 519, 2012 Variance*; and by including the following additional sections of the *Community Charter*, in reference to the Closed Session:

(90)(1) (m) a matter that, under another enactment, is such that the public may be excluded from the meeting;

(90)(2) (b) 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; and

That the Agenda be adopted, as amended.  

**CARRIED**
3. BUSINESS ITEMS

3.1 Request for Noise Bylaw No. 519, 2012 Variance

Res. No. 2020-06B-2 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Manager of Engineering Services, titled Request for Noise Bylaw 519, 2012 Variance – Trail Ave. Reconstruction Project be received.

CARRIED

Councillor Scott entered the meeting at 3:56pm.

Res. No. 2020-06B-3 – Moved/Seconded

That Council approve a variance to Noise Bylaw No. 519, 2012, allowing Maycon Contracting to complete road works at the intersection of Cowrie Street and Trail Avenue between 4am and 7am during the period from June 15, 2020 to June 16, 2020.

CARRIED

4. BYLAWS

5. CLOSED SESSION

Res. No. 2020-06B-4 – Moved/Seconded

“That the meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90 (1) (a), (c) and (m) and Section 90 (2) (b) of the Community Charter at 4:03 pm”

CARRIED

6. RECESS

The meeting recessed at 4:03 pm to go into a Closed portion.

7. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 5:02 pm.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Res. No. 2020-06B-5 – Moved/Seconded

That the Regular Council Meeting of June 10, 2020 be adjourned at 5:02 pm.

CARRIED

Certified Correct:

______________________________
Darnelda Siegers, Mayor

______________________________
Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
DISTRICT OF SECHELT
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
Held via Zoom Online Meeting Platform
Wednesday, June 17, 2020

PRESENT
Mayor D. Siegers; Councillors J. Kuester; T. Lamb; M. McLean; B. Rowe; E. Scott; A. Toth

STAFF
Chief Administrative Officer A Yeates; Director of Planning and Development Services A. Allen; Development Planning Manager I. Holl (partial attendance); Communications Manager J. Rogers; Manager of Financial Services B. Currie (partial attendance); Corporate Officer J. Frank and Recording Secretary J. Chamberlain

In accordance with the orders from the Provincial Health Officer regarding COVID-19 and the requirements for physical distancing, the June 17, 2020 Regular Council meeting was conducted by remote conferencing.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

The Mayor called the Regular Council Meeting to order at 7:00pm.

The Mayor provided the public with instructions on how to participate in the Question and Answer Period following adjournment of the meeting.

The Mayor asked for any Declarations of Conflict.

Councillor Rowe declared a conflict of interest for Item 8.1, OCP Amendment Bylaw and Zoning Amendment Bylaws (Silverstone), and for Business Item 10.1, OCP Consultation for Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) as she is employed with Vancouver Coastal Health.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Res. No. 2020-06C-1 – Moved/Seconded

That the Amended Agenda be adopted, as presented.

CARRIED
3. APPOINTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS

None.

4. PROCLAMATIONS

The Mayor proclaimed June 15, 2020 as Elder Abuse Awareness Day in the District of Sechelt.

Vicki Dobbyn, Coordinator, Sunshine Coast Community Response Network (Network) was recognized. Ms. Dobbyn noted that the proclamation recognizes that elder abuse and neglect is a problem and that the whole community has a role to play in solving, by keeping their eyes and ears open. She further noted that the pandemic has added to the dynamics and stressors that can cause abuse, as well as increased isolation. The Network have just published a handbook, “Recognizing and Responding to the Abuse and Neglect of Vulnerable Adults” for people who are in regular contact with older persons, and more information, including contacts, will be available in the June 19, 2020 Coast Reporter newspaper.

The Mayor thanked Ms. Dobbyn for the information.

5. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF COUNCIL

5.1 Minutes of the 7:00 pm Regular Council Meeting of June 3, 2020

Res. No. 2020-06C-2 – Moved/Seconded

That the Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of June 3, 2020 be adopted, as presented.

CARRIED

6. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

None.

7. COMMITTEE / COMMISSION MINUTES AND REPORTS

7.1 Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting of June 2, 2020

Res. No. 2020-06C-3 – Moved/Seconded

That the Minutes of the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting of June 2, 2020 be received.

CARRIED
Councillor Rowe, having declared a conflict of interest as she is employed by Vancouver Coast Health, recused herself from the meeting at 7:08pm.

8. BYLAWS

8.1 OCP Amendment Bylaw and Zoning Amendment Bylaws (Silverstone)

Res. No. 2020-06C-4 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Development Planning Manager regarding the application for an Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw and Zoning Amendment Bylaw for the Silverstone Long Term Care Home be received.

CARRIED

In discussion it was noted that:

- The proposed zoning would not restrict the operational model of the zone; it regulates the use, not the user.
- The Civic, Institutional and Utilities land use designation did anticipate for this type of facility, and the OCP Amendment is only to slightly shift the location of the land use designation position.
- Ministerial Orders in response to the pandemic have allowed for electronic Public Hearings.

Res. No. 2020-06C-5 – Moved/Seconded

That consideration of Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-303, 2020 (Silverstone) be deferred.

DEFEATED
Res. No. 2020-06C-6 – Moved/Seconded

That Council give second reading to Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone); and

That Council give second reading to Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-303, 2020 (Silverstone); and

That Council Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) be considered consistent with the District Financial Plan and Waste Management Plan; and

That Council authorize staff to schedule a Public Hearing for Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-303, 2020 (Silverstone); and

That Council endorse the following as a condition of the rezoning application to be met prior to Third reading of the bylaws:

a. That the applicant provides a detailed landscape plan prepared by a qualified professional landscape architect that incorporates the APC’s comments from their May 5, 2020 meeting.

b. That the site design and the landscape plan incorporate a public transit bus pull-out as per the SCRD’s Transit Division requirements; and

That Council endorse the following as conditions of the rezoning application to be met prior to adoption of the bylaws:

a. The registration of a Section 219 covenant on the title of the subject properties that establishes a 10 m wide buffer area around the west, north, and east sides of the Silverstone development site. This covenant would prohibit any land alteration, tree/vegetation removal, and/or buildings or structures within the covenant area.

b. The registration of a Section 219 covenant on the title of the subject properties that will ensure the implementation of the landscape plan for the Trellis site.

CARRIED

Res. No. 2020-06C-7 – Moved/Seconded

That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) be read a second time this 17th day of June, 2020.

CARRIED
Res. No. 2020-06C-8 – Moved/Seconded

That Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-303, 2020 (Silverstone) be read a second time this 17th day of June, 2020.

CARRIED

9. NEW BUSINESS

None.

10. BUSINESS ITEMS

10.1 OCP Consultation for Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone)

Res. No. 2020-06C-9 – Moved/Seconded

That on March 5, 2020, the District circulated a consultation referral form to the following persons, organizations and authorities in connection with the District of Sechelt Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone), requesting responses within 30 days and subsequently updated to allow for an additional 25 days:

i. Sunshine Coast Regional District of Sechelt
ii. Sechelt Fire Department
iii. shíshálh Nation
iv. FortisBC Energy/Energy Services Advisor
v. Vancouver Coastal Health Authority
vi. Telus
vii. Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure
viii. BC Hydro/BC Transmission C
ix. School District #46
x. Canada Post

AMENDED BY THE FOLLOWING

That the resolution be amended to include Community Associations and to change the name of BC Hydro/BC Transmission C to BC Hydro Corporation.
Res. No. 2020-06C-9 – Moved/Seconded

That on March 5, 2020, the District circulated a consultation referral form to the following persons, organizations and authorities in connection with the District of Sechelt Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone), requesting responses within 30 days and subsequently updated to allow for an additional 25 days:

i. Sunshine Coast Regional District of Sechelt
ii. Sechelt Fire Department
iii. shíshálh Nation
iv. FortisBC Energy/Energy Services Advisor
v. Vancouver Coastal Health Authority
vi. Telus
vii. Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure
viii. BC Hydro Corporation
ix. School District #46
x. Canada Post
xi. Community Associations

CARRIED

Res. No. 2020-06C-10 – Moved/Seconded

That the District of Sechelt Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) was introduced and received first reading; and

That Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 (Silverstone) applies to the mapping component of the Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw 492, 2010, in respect to a specific tract of land; and

That pursuant to section 475 of the Local Government Act, during the development, repeal or amendment of an Official Community Plan, the local government must provide one or more opportunities it considers appropriate for consultation with persons, organizations and authorities it considers will be affected; and

That pursuant to section 475 of the Local Government Act, the local government must consider whether the opportunities for consultation with one or more of the persons, organizations and authorities should be early and ongoing; and

That the staff report referred to in the June 17, 2020 Agenda Item 8.1, titled Trellis Rezoning Application – Silverstone Long Term Care Home OCP Amendment Bylaw No. 492-26, 2020 and Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-303, 2020 (Silverstone) describes the consultation process undertaken to date; and
That Council has considered which persons, organizations and authorities are appropriate to consult in connection with the Official Community Plan Amendment; and

That Council has considered whether consultation should be early and ongoing; and

That Council has considered whether consultation described in the staff report is sufficient in respect to the Official Community Plan Amendment; and

In connection with consultation pursuant to section 475 of the *Local Government Act*, Council resolves as follows:

i. That the persons, organizations and authorities listed in items 5 (i) to (x) above are the only entities that are appropriate to consult in connection with the OCP Amendment;

ii. That consultation should be early, but need not be ongoing; and

iii. That the consultation process described in the staff report is sufficient in respect to the OCP Amendment, and that no further consultation is necessary.

CARRIED

Councillor Rowe returned to the meeting at 7:31pm.

**10.2 Official Community Plan Consultation Policy 3.3.7**

Res. No. 2020-06C-11 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Director of Planning and Development regarding Official Community Plan Consultation Policy No. 3.3.7, be received.

CARRIED

In discussion it was noted that:

- The proposed policy does not intend to increase or decrease the amount of consultation, but rather to provide consistency, structure of process and to explicitly seek Council resolution to open and close engagement processes respecting OCP development.
  - When an OCP amendment is brought forward, the applicable community association(s) and business association(s) impacted would be included in the recommended list of referral agents.
- There is concern that the proposed policy could cause worry for Community Associations (CA) and believe there should be additional time provided for CA’s to fully understand the purpose of the proposed policy, before it comes into effect.
Res. No. 2020-06C-12 – Moved/Seconded

That Council refer Official Community Plan Consultation Policy 3.3.7 to staff until such time as a workshop can be held with the Sechelt Community Associations Forum to provide clarity on referral process, and then bring the report back for Council’s further consideration.

CARRIED

10.3 Extension of Sechelt Business Watch Program

Res. No. 2020-06C-13 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Mayor regarding the Extension of Sechelt Business Watch Program, be received.

CARRIED

In discussion it was noted that:

- The District of Sechelt must be involved in order for the program to be covered by Municipal Insurance Association.
- The Public Safety Reserve balance is currently $456,000.
- The proposed timeline of November 1, 2020 was to cover the program until the end of tourism season, which now continues into the month of October.
- There is some concern on extending the program as businesses are beginning to re-open, there could be a potential for long-term added responsibility for the District and the District partially funds the local RCMP.
  - It was added that the idea behind the program would be better suited for one of the RCMP-funded community watch programs like Block Watch or Citizens on Patrol.
- Retired RCMP officers are part of the volunteers that oversee the program and provide training to volunteers on what to look for and how to communicate it to the RCMP.

Res. No. 2020-06C-14 – Moved/Seconded

That Council approve a temporary extension of the Sechelt Business Watch Program on up to and including November 1, 2020; and

That Council approve District staff to oversee the Sechelt Business Watch Program and that overtime be approved to be paid out of the Public Safety Reserve Fund; and

That Council approve up to $9,525 from the Public Safety Reserve to fund operation of the Sechelt Business Watch Program up to and including November 1, 2020.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Councillor Toth
10.4 2019 Annual Report

The Mayor provided the public in attendance with instructions on how to participate in the Annual Meeting portion of the Council meeting, and invited comments. The Recording Secretary confirmed that there were no submissions received from the public related to the 2019 Annual Report.

Res. No. 2020-06C-15 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Communications Manager, with attached 2019 Annual Report, be received.

CARRIED

11. REPORT FROM NON-STANDING COMMITTEES, LIAISON APPOINTMENTS AND GENERAL REPORTS FROM COUNCIL

11.1 Reports from Councillors

Councillor McLean reported that he attended the Housing Advisory Committee (HAC) meeting and noted they are continuing to build an application guide for free-standing rental suites, referenced by the how-to guide created by the City of Nelson for laneway housing.

Councillor Lamb reported that he attended a Sunshine Coast Regional Economic Development Organization (SCREDO) meeting and noted that they are working with Urban Systems Ltd., to create an index of industrial commercial properties to create opportunities for growth. SCREDO plan to approach BC Ferries to try for a seat on the Ferry Advisory Committee as well as try to arrange a meeting with BC Ferries’ President and CEO, Mark Collins. SCREDO has joined the Sunshine Coast Business Recovery Centre, which is a local program that offers information, resources, and support for businesses in the community impacted by the pandemic. Information can be found on their website at www.scbrc.ca. Councillor Lamb additionally noted that Sechelt Downtown Business Association offers free support to advertise your business on their website.

Councillor Kuester reported that she attended the HAC meeting and is excited to see how things progress. She has been organizing gifts from local businesses for graduates on graduation day, which is June 19th. She noted that the graduation will be aired on the SD46 YouTube channel on June 24th. Councillor Kuester took a moment to thank all businesses for their support and donations for the 2020 graduates.

Councillor Toth reported that registration for the Canada Day drive-by parades are open and available for anyone who want to participate – Register at www.secheltdowntown.com.

Councillor Rowe noted she is happy to see the HAC’s progress to date. She attended the Sechelt Hospital Foundation AGM to speak from a leadership perspective on the support measures and emergency funds provided and how it enabled further planning. She added that she is continually amazed and thankful for the community’s generosity.
Mayor Siegers reported that she has been appointed as a member of the Island Coastal Economic Trust Executive Board and will serve a 2-year term starting July 19th. She advised that she was honoured to have provided a graduation speech for Chatelech Secondary School graduates. She advised that she took part in the Solidarity March at Hackett Park and noted that most people were following distance guidelines. She commended the RCMP for stepping in and providing traffic control for the March. Mayor Beamish, Chair Pratt and Mayor Siegers met with BC Ferries’ Mark Collins, President and CEO and Brian Anderson, Vice President – Strategy and Community Engagement in response to the recent service reduction announcements, which have since been revised. It was noted in the meeting that BC Ferries is losing between $800,000-$1M/day providing contractually required sailings and when they consider additional sailings, they must break even in costs. Mark Collins indicated that they saw an 80% drop in ridership within days in response to the pandemic and are now using capital funds for their operational and contractual needs. More details on the meeting will be available on her Facebook page. Mayor Siegers noted that in addition to Councillor Lamb’s report, Sunshine Coast Business Recovery Centre will be hosting a Business Recovery forum on June 25th at 8:30-11am, where they will be looking for what local businesses will need in the next three months and long-term.

11.2 SCRQ Board – Council Representative Report

Mayor Siegers reported that the SCRQ Board took part in a Pride Month photo. She further noted that at the upcoming Infrastructure Services Committee meeting there will be an update on water, and Telus would be speaking on services for the Sunshine Coast.

Councillor Toth’s SCRQ report was included in the agenda package. He added that SCRQ staff have begun to put together water update videos, which are available on the SCRQ’s YouTube channel.

12. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING ITEMS

12.1 Council Correspondence

Res. No. 2020-06C-16 – Moved/Seconded

That Council Correspondence included on the June 17, 2020 Regular Council Meeting Agenda be received.

CARRIED

Res. No. 2020-06C-17 – Moved/Seconded

That Council support the $50 funding request for one delegate from the Sunshine Coast Youth Council representative for District of Sechelt and making space available for their meetings.

CARRIED
Res. No. 2020-06C-18 – Moved/Seconded

That Council Correspondence item 3. 06-11, Email, T Logan, [Sechelt Downtown Business Association] SDBA Small Capital Request Funding be referred to staff for the consideration of staffing implications, potential funding source, insurance and regulation requirements and bring a report back with the information to the June 24, 2020 Special Council meeting.

CARRIED

13. MAYOR, COUNCIL AND STAFF EMERGENCY ITEMS

There were no emergency items brought forward.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Res. No. 2020-06C-19 – Moved/Seconded

That the Regular Council meeting of June 17, 2020 be adjourned at 8:26 pm.

CARRIED

Certified Correct:

______________________________  ________________________________
Darnelda Siegers, Mayor         Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
DISTRICT OF SECHELT
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
Held via Zoom Online Meeting Platform
Wednesday, June 24, 2020

PRESENT  Mayor D. Siegers; Councillors J. Kuester; T. Lamb; M. McLean; B. Rowe; E. Scott; A. Toth

STAFF    Chief Administrative Officer A. Yeates; Director of Planning and Development Services A. Allen; Director of Financial Services D. Douglas; Manager of Financial Services B. Currie; Development Planning Manager I. Holl; Corporate Officer J. Frank and Recording Secretary J. Chamberlain

GUEST    Dr. Geoff McKee, Medical Health Officer – Vancouver Coastal Health

In accordance with the orders from the Provincial Health Officer regarding COVID-19 and the requirements for physical distancing, the June 24, 2020 Special Council meeting was conducted by remote conferencing.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICT
The Mayor called the Special Council Meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Res. No. 2020-06D-1 – Moved/Seconded

That the agenda be amended to include Item 9.1, Overdose Prevention Services on the Sunshine Coast; Item 9.2, BC Ferries Schedule Update from Councillor McLean; additional background information to Item 10.1, Development Variance Permit No. 2020-03 (Polly): (1) – Letter to Council from Applicant’s Legal Counsel; and (2) – Public Submissions to Council; and

That the Agenda be adopted, as amended.

CARRIED

Councillor McLean declared a potential conflict of interest with Item 3.1, Len Polly, Applicant – Development Variance Permit No. 2020-03 (Polly) and Item 10.1, Development Variance Permit No. 2020-03 (Polly) as he lives close to the development.
Councillor McLean, having declared a conflict of interest as he lives close to the subject application property, recused himself from the meeting at 3:03pm.

3. **APPOINTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS**

3.1 **Len Polly, Applicant – Development Variance Permit No. 2020-03 (Polly)**

Len Polly provided Council with his long-term plan of the property and history of the subdivision application. In discussion it was further noted that:

- Item two within the Development Variance Permit (DVP), the exemption of underground cables along Marine Way frontage, was approved by Council in 2015.
  - To accommodate this, two new poles would be required in front of the neighbouring properties.
  - All services are already underground along the subject area of Marine Way.
  - BC Hydro are not in favour of underground construction.
- Mr. Polly asks that Council approve the changes within the DVP so that he can move forward with his development.
- The property is currently listed for sale.
  - If the DVP is granted, Mr. Polly would remove the listing for the entire parcel.
  - His plan, should the DVP be granted, is to sell one lot, and build homes on the other two lots.
- The property topography is varied but is leveled at 5 meters from the top of bank, making for an easier location to build a home on.
- Due to the odd shape and the 8-meter setback dedication of Lot 3, it makes the building area tighter.
- The property is five lots away from the MacKenzie Marina and Mr. Polly believes it is not within an environmentally sensitive area.

The Mayor thanked Mr. Polly for his presentation.

Councillor McLean returned to the meeting at 3:12pm.

4. **PROCLAMATIONS**

None.

5. **ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES OF COUNCIL**

None.

6. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

None.
7. COMMITTEE / COMMISSION MINUTES AND REPORTS

None.

8. BYLAWS

None.

9. NEW BUSINESS

9.2 BC Ferries Schedule Update

Councillor McLean attended a Ferry Advisory Committee meeting with BC Ferries representatives and provided an update on the BC Ferries schedule and additional information:

- Mid-day sailings will resume Thursday – Monday for the next two weeks, and beyond that has yet to be determined.
- BC Ferries committed to monitoring traffic levels and adjusting service levels, as needed. They also committed to continue an ongoing dialogue with the community as they move forward.
- On-time performance for the last month was 38%, in comparison to 72% in June 2019.
- BC Ferries has announced they want to go to a 2hr 10min round-trip, to reduce staffing costs, which is not sufficient and will continue to cause late sailings.
- Vehicle traffic is down about 25% from June 2019 to June 2020 and increasing every week.
  - The Provincial government just announced Phase 3 of the Restart Plan, which allows for interprovincial travel.
- There has been a 27% reduction in sailings per week in comparison to this time last year.
- It was put forward to ask BC Ferries for an immediate resumption of the 2019 schedule to allow for more sailings during peak season and allow sailings to be more on-time.

In discussion it was further noted that:

- BC Ferries has been responsive and have noted they welcome feedback, which provides them real-life impacts of residents and businesses.
- It was recognized that the 2019 schedule for Route 3 reflected connections to Nanaimo (Route 2) scheduled departures.
- Town of Gibsons and Sunshine Coast Regional District (SCRD) will also be discussing this at their upcoming meetings.
Res. No. 2020-06D-2 – Moved/Seconded

That Council send a letter to BC Ferries under the Mayor’s signature to:

a) Thank BC Ferries for their responsiveness to the community, for reinstating sailings and increasing turnaround times to address issues with sailings being on-time;
b) Ask that BC Ferries re-instate the summer 2019 schedule for the Sunshine Coast route; and
c) Ask that BC Ferries continue to engage the community as they have been, to ensure arising issues are addressed in a timely manner.

CARRIED

9.1 Overdose Prevention Services on the Sunshine Coast

Res. No. 2020-06D-3 – Moved/Seconded

That the verbal report from Councillor McLean regarding BC Ferries Schedule Update, be received; and

That the correspondence from Dr. Geoff McKee, Medical Health Officer, dated June 23, 2020, regarding Overdose Prevention Services on the Sunshine Coast, be received.

CARRIED

The Mayor recognized that Dr. Geoff McKee, Medical Health Officer, Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH) had joined the meeting. The Mayor provided the following information:

• She received notification that on June 21st, an unsanctioned pop-up overdose prevention site had been set up on private property in Sechelt, and would continue to be set up to provide services for residents of the community and the Sunshine Coast.
  o The property owner does not want it on their property.
• There have been at least three reported overdose deaths on the Sunshine Coast recently.
  o The peer community are very concerned that drugs are heavily laced with fentanyl and overdoses are occurring regularly.
• Local government leaders met with the Community Action Team (CAT) and have noted that the ideal situation would be to have a temporary sanctioned site set up immediately and have VCH find a more permanent solution for the community.

Dr. McKee, provided a summary of the points in his letter. In discussion it was noted that:

• There is a difference between Supervised Consumption Sites, which are applied for through the federal program and the more recent Overdose Prevention Sites (OPS), which are created in response to the Public Health Emergency that was declared in 2016.
• Lifeguard, an app that helps combat the opioid crisis, has been launched, should an OPS not be available.
• Dr. McKee’s letter has also been provided to and will be discussed by the Town of Gibsons, shíshálh Nation and SCRD meetings over the next two days.
• There are many varied models of overdose prevention services, but a key component to the exemption under the Public Health Emergency, is supervised consumption.
  o OPS’s like the one in Powell River, also act as a connection point for other healthcare and social services within the community.
    ▪ The CAT was an essential platform for the success of the Powell River OPS.
• VCH does not have a designation out for this pop-up site but will provide the peer-run site with training and supplies.
• It was suggested an OPS could be a mobile unit, such as a motorhome.
• The organizers of the pop-up overdose prevention site have said they will continue to operate in Sechelt until a sanctioned site is in place.
• As far as legality, under the Public Health Emergency Order, the site must have approval to be in possession of and use of substances.
• Community Associations and Sechelt Downtown Business Association should be part of the consultation process.
• Council is being asked to consider identifying a District-owned property for a sanctioned temporary OPS, in place of the private property location(s) it is currently being set up on.
• It is not anticipated that a local site would attract non-residents to the community, as the Greater Vancouver area has many services and resources available.

Councillor McLean experienced technical difficulties and left the meeting at 3:49pm.
Councillor McLean returned to the meeting at 3:50pm.

Councillor McLean experienced technical difficulties and left the meeting at 4:06pm.
Councillor McLean returned to the meeting at 4:08pm.

Res. No. 2020-06D-4 — Moved/Seconded

That the letter from Dr. Geoff McKee, Medical Health Officer regarding Overdose Prevention Services on the Sunshine Coast be referred to staff to identify implications of setting up a temporary overdose prevention site, and to identify potentially suitable District-owned property location(s) for a site, with exclusion of designated parks.

CARRIED

10. BUSINESS ITEMS

Councillor McLean, having declared a conflict of interest as he lives close to the subject application property, recused himself from the meeting at 4:11pm.
10.1 Development Variance Permit No. 2020-03 (Polly)

Res. No. 2020-06D-5 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Development Planning Manager regarding the application for Development Variance Permit 2020-03 be received.

CARRIED

In discussion it was noted:

- There was some concern raised over the reduction of the setback.
  - It would be reasonable to facilitate a 14-meter setback as there is a steep bank at the end of the property which makes sea-level flooding and erosion a low risk for the building area.
- Hydro and telecommunication services are not undergrounded along Marine Way as previously indicated by the applicant.
  - The service connections from Marine Way to the property will need to be undergrounded.
- There have been discussions in the past that the property should connect to sewer lines along Marine Way.
- Marine Way has nearly reached its maximum developability and there are no sidewalks close to the property, making a sidewalk requirement appear unnecessary.
  - There are currently no District capital project plans to have sidewalks constructed in the area and a sidewalk would mean less parking, which is already limited in the area.

Res. No. 2020-06D-6 – Moved/Seconded

That Council approve Development Variance Permit 2020-03 for Lot 105, DL 1331 & 1437, Plan 18319 (PID 007-194-129); and

That Council approve the removal of the sidewalk from the road requirements in accordance with Section 38(4) of Subdivision and Development Control Services Bylaw No. 430, 2003.

CARRIED

Res. No. 2020-06D-7 – Moved/Seconded

That Council approve a Flood Control Requirement Exemption of 1m for the proposed Lot 3 as part of subdivision application file number 3320-2017-05b to reduce the setback from 15m to 14m.

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Councillors Toth and Rowe
Councillor McLean returned to meeting at 4:47pm.

10.2 **Consideration of Deferral of the 2020 Tax Sale**

Res. No. 2020-06D-8 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Manager of Financial Services regarding the Deferral of Tax Sale be received.

CARRIED

Res. No. 2020-06D-9 – Moved/Seconded

That Council request staff to prepare a report and bylaw to defer the Tax Sale for 2020.

CARRIED

10.3 **Sechelt Downtown Business Association ICET Grant Request**

Res. No. 2020-06D-10 – Moved/Seconded

That the report from the Corporate Officer and Manager of Financial Services regarding Sechelt Downtown Business Association Island Coastal Economic Trust (ICET) application for a street patio be received.

CARRIED

In discussion it was noted that initially the request was for one patio, but the request was adjusted to two patio locations.

Res. No. 2020-06D-11 – Moved/Seconded

That the Sechelt Downtown Business Association’s application for an Island Coastal Economic Trust grant to assist with installation of two free standing on-street patios, be endorsed; and

That $4,000 in matched funds for the Sechelt Downtown Business Association’s application to the Island Economic Trust grant for an on-street patio be allocated from the Council Contingency operating account.

CARRIED
11. REPORT FROM NON-STANDING COMMITTEES, LIAISON APPOINTMENTS AND GENERAL REPORTS FROM COUNCIL

None.

12. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/RELEASE OF CLOSED MEETING ITEMS

None.

13. MAYOR, COUNCIL AND STAFF EMERGENCY ITEMS

There were no emergency items brought forward.

14. CLOSED SESSION

Res. No. 2020-06D-12 – Moved/Seconded

“That the meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90 (1) (k) and (l) and Section 90 (2) (b) of the Community Charter at 5:12 pm.”

CARRIED

15. RECESS

The meeting recessed at 5:12 pm to go into a Closed Portion.

16. RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 5:39 pm.

17. ADJOURNMENT

Res. No. 2020-06D-13 – Moved/Seconded

That the Special Council meeting of June 24, 2020 be adjourned at 5:39 pm.

CARRIED

Certified Correct:

______________________________  ______________________________
Darnelda Siegers, Mayor                Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
DISTRICT OF SECHELT
MINUTES OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
held at via Zoom Online Meeting Platform
Wednesday, July 8, 2020

PRESENT    Mayor D. Siegers, and Councillors T. Lamb, M. McLean, E. Scott and A. Toth
REGRETS    Councillors J. Kuster and B. Rowe
STAFF      Chief Administrative Officer A. Yeates, Corporate Officer J. Frank and Recording Secretary J. Chamberlain

In accordance with the orders from the Provincial Health Officer regarding COVID-19 and the requirements for physical distancing, the July 8, 2020 Regular Council meeting was conducted by remote conferencing.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

The Mayor called the Regular Council Meeting to order at 3:33 pm.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Res. No. 2020-07A-1 – Moved/Seconded

That the Agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ITEMS

4. BYLAWS

5. CLOSED SESSION

Res. No. 2020-07A-2 – Moved/Seconded

“That the meeting be closed to the public pursuant to Section 90 (1) (c), (d), (e), (g) and (i) of the Community Charter at 3:33 pm.”

CARRIED
6. **RECESS**
The meeting recessed at 3:33 pm to go into a Closed portion.

7. **RECONVENE**
The meeting reconvened at 5:30 pm.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

Res. No. 2020-07A-3 – Moved/Seconded

That the Regular Council Meeting of July 8, 2020 be adjourned at 5:30 pm.

CARRIED

Certified Correct:

__________________________  ____________________________
Darnelda Siegers, Mayor  Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair McLean called the Committee of the Whole Meeting to order at 3:00pm and asked for any declarations of conflict.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Recommendation No. 1

Moved/Seconded

That the agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

3. APPOINTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS

3.1 S/Sgt. Poppy Hallam – Sunshine Coast RCMP 2020 – 2021 Strategic Plan

S/Sgt. Poppy Hallam provided Council an overview of the Sunshine Coast RCMP’s 2020 – 2021 Strategic Plan. She advised that:

- “Fencing targets” refers to identifying those who take and distribute stolen property.
• Now that the general investigation section has a full staff complement, their focus will be Provincial Tactical Enforcement Priority, which is identifying primary suspect(s) responsible for the increase in violent crime, drugs, and property crime.
• The Kairos blanket exercise is mandatory for all staff; those that did not participate prior to the pandemic will do so as soon as the exercise becomes available again.
• There is a provincial seasonal policing budget provided for the summer months to enhance police visibility.
• Previously scheduled training has been cancelled due to the pandemic.
  o Some socially distanced employee wellness training could be possible.
• Impaired driving statistics include both drug and alcohol impairment, but there are not as many impaired by drug investigations.
  o There are drug recognition experts available to the local detachment to identify drug-impaired driving.
• There are some problems encountered with regulation and jurisdictional differences between medical and non-medical marijuana grow operations.
  o Legal medical marijuana grow operations are confirmed with Health Canada.
  o Police have ways to monitor and use surveillance on suspected illegal grow operations that can result in the ability to obtain search warrants.
  o There should be more jurisdictional oversight flexibility to timely address things like fire hazards, bylaw contraventions and safety concerns.
• Property crime remains high and is a large focus for the detachment.
• Crisis de-escalation training is mandatory, and S/Sgt. Poppy Hallam is a trained hostage crisis negotiator.
• Foot patrol statistics are now captured differently than they were previously, and the focus of the detachment has shifted to more serious crime surveillance, resulting in the significant decrease of foot patrols statistics from 2019.
• Break and Enter files for Sechelt are largely occurring in the downtown Sechelt area.
• In response to the pandemic, the detachment has enacted the Business Continuity Plan, which outlines how Sunshine Coast RCMP carry on business in an emergency.
  o It has been mostly business as usual, but there has been reduced contact with public.

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

None.

5. **BUSINESS ITEMS**

None.
6. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Recommendation No. 2**

**Moved/Seconded**

That the Committee of the Whole meeting of June 10, 2020 be adjourned at 3:45 pm.

**CARRIED**

Certified Correct:

_____________________________  ________________________________
Matt McLean, Chair             Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
DISTRICT OF SECHELT
MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Via Zoom Virtual Meeting
Tuesday, July 7, 2020

PRESENT  Commissioners  Paul Mears (Chair), Ken Crozier, Randy Knill, Darryl Brin, Dieter Greiner, Archie Maclean, Javier Siu and Joanne Van Ginkel

REGRETS  Commissioners Sharif Senbel and Jonathan Baker

STAFF  Development Planning Manager, I. Holl; Planner, Sven Koberwitz; Recording Secretary, F. Bol

1.  CALL TO ORDER
The Chair called the Advisory Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2.  ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Recommendation No. 1 – Agenda

Moved/Seconded

That the Agenda be adopted.

CARRIED

3.  ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1  Minutes of the June 2, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

Recommendation No. 2 – Minutes of the June 2, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

That the minutes of June 2, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

Moved/Seconded.

That the minutes of June 2, 2020 Advisory Planning Commission meeting be adopted.

CARRIED
4. **APPOINTMENTS AND DELEGATIONS**

None

5. **BUSINESS ITEMS AND REPORTS**

5.1 **3090-2020-05 Development Variance Permit for RTC Properties**
- DVP to vary maximum height in CD-39 (RTC) at 5845 Sunshine Coast

The following representatives were noted as present in the audience:
Schmidt + Woolf Architects: Tyler Schmidt and Richard Colgan

APC members noted the following comments:
- Height Variance: Subzone C lower than the two neighbouring at height of 10.5 m, which is reflective of the original proposal; this is the 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation of design and is seen as historical.
- Landscaping: Are Douglas Firs on Ocean Side staying? Are trees on highway side sustained?
  - Staff replied yes, there would be a landscape and tree management plan required prior to development permit issuance.
- Topic: Tonight’s discussion is height variance and initial impression on the form and character.
- Emergency Access: Road off highway has disappeared from plan; this was fire emergency access only and is currently not in proposal.
- Height variance concern: Is the extra height variance in the center requested for an elevator?
  - Staff replied yes, the 11.6m height is to accommodate stairwell and elevator.
- APC noted it was a nicely terraced building that steps down even lower than the allowed height, they would be in favour of allowing the additional height of 1.4 m.

**Recommendation No. 3**

**Moved/Seconded.**

That the Advisory Planning Commission supports the height variance as proposed for 3090-2020-05 Development Variance Permit for RTC Properties.

**CARRIED**

APC members noted the following comments on impressions of form and character:
- The project suits the site; renderings are supportive of character of the village;
- Color: color renderings benefit and enliven the project; sophisticated design may be improved with color; liked the green as color element in the building;
• Terracing: Is reminiscent of Vancouver Courthouse; terracing and massing of the building compares to the Watermark; liked the consistency and linear lines on the terraces;
• Landscaping: looks like hedging is outside of glass railings so that it’s sort of public; color could be added depending on what plant material used; like the Douglas firs used in the plan;
• Townhomes: the townhomes and different housing types are acceptable;
• Liked the look of the building; choices for siding and balconies give the building a different texture and feel than the Watermark;
• North elevation and 3-D elevation: liked the balanced symmetrical look, but windows don’t match the floor plan and are smaller than what is shown on the elevations; same applies to 2nd and 3rd floor stair lobby;
• Entrance to Ground Floor Units: Is the entrance through the garages?
• Path on 3-D drawing: South side – Stairs down to water not clear on plan; how do they fit in?
  o Staff replied that some of those may be place holders for expansion of Snicket Park and it would be up to District to provide finishing improvements.
• Traffic between buildings: Is traffic encouraged between 2 buildings?
  o Staff replied it’s something the DoS can look at; there is no accommodation at this point and public access would be through Shorncliffe Ave.
• Tyler Schmidt (applicant) – clarified that:
  1) Rendering is off in topography, but the backyards to lower units are about 10-15 ft higher than the beach below, there will be a vertical separation between public and private areas, and we will develop the interface between public and private;
  2) There is entrance through the parkade (own private parking garage) and developing path system with landscape architect for entrances from building exterior;
  3) Landscaping – the intent is to keep the large hedge and a trench required for BC Hydro; green stripes on plan are planters in front of glass and similar to Evelyn Drive Project in West Vancouver designed to provide softer landscape edge to terraces using low maintenance shrubs.
• APC members would like to see more precedent images of similar developments;
• Uncovered Patios: Lots of square footage but people are looking for covered patio areas. How will this evolve over time? Is it worth integrating at this stage?
  o Applicant had looked into separation of patio with fireplace and other ideas, but the market loves large patios; this is an outdoor living space; umbrellas can also add color punch; we can add design controls along the way.
  o Roof design: 4th floor difficult to see from plan. Is there anything happening above the penthouse on the roof? Do you mean for a usable roof or green roof? Unsure if furniture is shown on plan or if it’s some sort of community space.
  o Applicant replied that no, there isn’t anything; peaked roof design for residential flavor; roof skirts add significant component to the design; no one is really able to view the roof; you would probably come off the lobby at the penthouse level to create outdoor amenity area as a possibility (exclusive and private); not yet decided at this point.
Recommendation No. 4

Moved/Seconded.

That the Advisory Planning Commission supports the comments listed for building form and character as discussed for 3090-2020-05 Development Variance Permit for RTC Properties.

CARRIED

5.2 3360-2020-03 Rezoning for Westcor Lands Ltd.

- Rezoning for multi-family townhouse development at 5410 Mills Road
- Public Submission (ADDED INSERT)

The following representatives were noted as present in the audience:
Westcor Lands: Steve Dunton (Applicant), Bruce Mason and Nicholas Waissbluth

APC members noted the following comments regarding: compatibility with surrounding density to land uses, issue of inclusion of secondary suites and townhouse units, general site planning and layout, provision of outdoor spaces, amenities for residents, the issue of reduction of required off street parking and potential utilization of off-street parking, and preliminary comments on the form and character of the development:

- Sidewalks: There is a definite need for sidewalks in the area, are there any?
  - Staff replied the new development on Burdett Rd has sidewalks and also Jasper Rd.
- Developments: Are there other multifamily developments in the area?
  - Staff replied there are other developments in the area: Tyler Rd, one off Jasper & McCourt Rd and in the downtown Ebbtide Complex as well as others.
- Overall Preliminary Comments:
  - In favor of the idea of multifamily housing in the area of West Sechelt;
  - Development appears to be needed, but history has shown that this doesn’t work in West Sechelt; developers tend to change plans (like Chelsea development on Tyler Heights);
  - These housing types don’t sell in West Sechelt and they may have tough time with neighbours;
  - Project is not appropriate for the area, density is too great and needs to be transitioned, such as development on Tyler Rd (30% less dense); Placing 56 units in the neighbourhood is far too much in the immediate community;
  - Correspondence letter from community members: Several APC members agree with letter contents as it outlines valid reasons to rethink the project;
  - Housing availability: Very little housing available in the area, it’s very homogenous and not much variety in the area;
  - Amenities and infrastructure: Need to be done right for access to bus stops, school, etc.
  - Fair amount of traffic at times on the Norwest Bay Rd and should be addressed;
- Public transportation: Is nearby, but it’s hard to support reduction of parking and will be a problem for neighbours;
- Unit types: Not much variety: one is a 2 storey, 3-bedroom townhouse and the other has a basement suite with 1 window in the bedroom and no windows in the living room, dining room or kitchen;
- Livability issues: Too condensed, requesting relaxation of setback for no real reason other than more units; not much green space (turf grass), no place for amenities (playground area, meeting rooms, storage or exercise room) on site. The livability is not there;
- Site plan diagram (sheet 22, pg. 59): Arrows show pedestrian circulation going into neighbours back yards and illustrates not understanding the site very well;
- Space Issues: When you have bigger property you tend to collect more things (cars, boats, etc.), if you have limited space you typically tend to live within your space and keep your possessions to a minimum;
- Landscaping: Some approval of the vegetation proposed and deciduous trees, native species, plant pallet not extensive, but enough for a small setting; like the interior parkette that gave feeling of courtyard;
- Architecture: Some approval of gables, finishes and insets (doorways) and seen as an overall clever use of the space;
- Traffic study: There are more than 40 units with perhaps over 80 vehicles on Mills Rd; residents will be concerned about traffic and safety of the surrounding area
  - Staff stated Engineering Dept. assessing proposal to determine if traffic study is warranted; OCP has language over maximum trips that would trigger a more comprehensive study, so they’ll be asking for an initial assessment that would give an estimate if that threshold is being met (50 vehicles at peak traffic).

Floor opened to Steve Dunton (Applicant) who provided the following comments:
- Westcor Lands had prepared a 25-unit subdivision on 3 lots, provided massing plan concept, and was told to provide multifamily by unnamed party;
- Appreciate neighbour’s letters that they don’t want neighbourhood to change;
- Where will workers coming to Sechelt live? Plans are not yet completed, and we have pressured to provide housing. If we go with less than 45 units, we miss the mark on starter homes pricing – and things become extreme in cost;
- We need to provide some density someplace so why not west Sechelt? Why can’t we densify a little section here and there?
- Storage: All units have a crawl space and there are lock-off suites in the basement; there has to be mix up with multifamily to provide housing for people;
- Infrastructure: DoS planners and engineering staff will ensure that we have proper connectivity and work completed to a very high level (you will see sidewalks, curbs, landscaping, etc.).

Floor opened to Wayne Plimmer (Audience member) who provided the following comments:
- It’s hard to fit items into a crawl space (bike, kayak, etc.);
- Upset that this was ongoing for several months and we didn’t find out until 2 weeks ago and neighbours are opposed to the project;
Upset that members of the committee have not yet read our submission and hope this will be done before recommendation to Council;
We were told there would be 25 homes and understand Council voted for more density;
Parking amended from 75 spaces to 100. This is a loss of 11 separate greenspaces;
developer has made pitch that Sechelt can’t attract young families, but many young families have moved into this area;
We are not opposed to multifamily, but this is done in excess (setbacks, parking, etc.);
When staff encourage APC to consider compatibility with the surrounding area and land use, it certainly is not compatible. In terms of provision of outdoor spaces and amenities, it’s too dense; we need to consider the people living in the area;
Form and character – We like the Strand, why don’t we put a Strand on the property? (Reference to item 5.1).
Overall: We are not opposed to multifamily development, but other projects have bigger houses and more livable area; this project has issues with close spaces, screening yards, setbacks, variances, amenity contributions. Not in support of the setback variances, the parking variances, etc.
Floor opened to Steve Dunton (Applicant) who provided the following comments:
He could lower density and cut down to 32 units on back section of Mills Rd if there was support for it. He thinks Sechelt needs 44 of these units as people are demanding more houses.

**Recommendation No. 5**

**Moved/Seconded.**

That the Advisory Planning Commission support the concept of multifamily housing but want to see project take into account the items listed in the discussion for 3360-2020-03 Rezoning for Westcor Lands Ltd. Application.

**CARRIED**

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Advisory Planning Commission meeting of July 7, 2020 was adjourned at 7:50 pm.

____________________________  __________________________
Paul Mears, Chair                 Jo-Anne Frank, Corporate Officer
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council  MEETING DATE: July 15, 2020
FROM: Manager of Financial Services
SUBJECT: 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw
FILE NO: 1980 – Tax Sale

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from the Manager of Financial Services regarding the 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw be received

2. That the District of Sechelt 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 593, 2020 be read a first, second and third time; and proceed with adoption.

PURPOSE

That Council consider giving three readings and adoption to the District of Sechelt 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 595, 2020 to defer the tax sale from 2020 to 2021.

OPTIONS

1. Endorse the above recommendations.
2. Council could defer the decision and request further information.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background
On June 24, 2020 staff brought forward a report to inform Council of the option to defer the 2020 tax sale as permitted under the order of the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At the meeting, Council resolved to request staff to prepare a report and bylaw to defer the Tax Sale for 2020. Today’s report presents the bylaw, which provides the framework to defer the Tax Sale scheduled for Monday, September 28, 2020 to Monday, September 27, 2021.

Strategic Plan
Strategic Priority 2, enhancing fiscal sustainability. The District focuses on fiscal sustainability of the municipality to ensure we can contribute to providing necessary services and infrastructure.
Financial Implications
The deferment of the tax sale could potentially delay the payment of approximately $150,000 in delinquent property taxes.

Communications
Written notice must be sent within 2 weeks of the bylaw’s adoption to the property owner of a property that is subject to the deferred annual tax sale advising the owner that:

(i) The annual tax sale for 2020 has been deferred to September 27, 2021,
(ii) Any taxes that are delinquent will remain delinquent for 2021, with applicable interest charges, and
(iii) Unless the delinquent taxes are paid before the start of the tax sale on September 27, 2021, the property will be subject to tax sale on September 27, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Currie
Manager of Financial Services
DISTRICT OF SECHELT

2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 593, 2020

A Bylaw to establish the deferral of the 2020 Property Tax Sale for the District of Sechelt

WHEREAS Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General Ministerial Order M159 (COVID-19), dated May 15, 2020, authorizes municipalities to, by bylaw, defer the date of the 2020 annual tax sale;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Sechelt deems it desirable to defer the annual tax sale for 2020;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Sechelt in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

1.0 TITLE

1.1 This Bylaw may be cited as “District of Sechelt 2020 Tax Sale Deferral Bylaw No. 593, 2020”.

2.0 PROVISIONS

2.1 This Bylaw is being enacted pursuant to Ministerial Order No. M159, Local Government Finance (COVID-19) Order.

2.2 The annual tax sale pursuant to Division 7 [Annual Municipal Tax Sale] of Part 16 [Municipal Provisions] of the Local Government is deferred until September 27, 2021, with the effect that the annual tax sale would be on that date in respect of the upset price described in section 649 [upset price for tax sale] of that Act.

2.3 A decision by a court that any part of the Bylaw is illegal, void, or unenforceable severs that part from this Bylaw, and is not to affect the balance of this Bylaw.

3.0 EFFECTIVE DATE

3.1 This Bylaw comes into force and effect on the date of its adoption.

READ A FIRST TIME THIS DAY OF 2020
READ A SECOND TIME THIS DAY OF 2020
READ A THIRD TIME THIS DAY OF 2020
ADOPTED THIS DAY OF 2020

_______________________________  ______________________________
Mayor                                         Corporate Officer
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Development Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Zoning Bylaw Amendment 25-289, 2018
6317 Bligh Road, West Sechelt
FILE NO: 3360-20 2017-03 (Everbrite Ventures)

RECOMMENDATIONS
1. THAT the report from the Development Planning Manager regarding Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018 be received.
2. THAT Council give Third reading to Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018.

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to present Zoning Bylaw Amendment 25-289, 2018 for Third reading. This follows the May 20, 2020 report regarding changing the community amenity contribution and infrastructure conditions of rezoning. No changes have been made to the bylaw. The other conditions of rezoning remain the same. The public hearing was waived in accordance with section 464(2) of the Local Government Act (LGA).

OPTIONS
1. That Council adopt the recommendations as presented above.
2. That Council defer the application pending additional information as directed.
3. That Council reject the application.

PROPOSAL
The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from R-3 (Residential 3) to R-1 (Residential 1) to enable an 8-lot subdivision with a minimum parcel size of 500 m².

ANALYSIS
The following conditions of rezoning must be met prior to the bylaw being considered for adoption.

- Registration of a section 219 covenant on title to ensure all new homes are constructed to an “adaptable” accessibility standard.
- Payment of a cash contribution in the amount of $82,400 for affordable housing.
• Registration of a section 219 covenant that restricts any subdivision, development, or building until the following works are completed or incorporated into a signed servicing agreement:
  i. Extended Bligh Road improvements constructed to an Urban Local Half Road standard from the subject property east to the centre line of Mills Road.
• Registration of a Statutory Right of Way for municipal sewer and storm water services over the neighbouring property legally described as Lot A, Block Q, DL4293, Plan 22570.

Once those conditions have been met then the bylaw will be brought back for Council to consider adoption.

CONCLUSION
The proposed development fits within the neighbourhood context of single-family residential development. The bylaw is consistent with the OCP. The bylaw is ready to be considered for Third reading. The applicant will have to meet the rezoning conditions described previously before the bylaw can be considered for adoption.

Respectfully submitted,

Ian Holl, MCIP, RPP
Development Planning Manager

Associated documents:
1 – Zoning Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018

| Reviewed by: | D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services | X |
|Reviewed by: | J. Rogers, Communications Manager | X |
|Reviewed by: | J. Frank, Corporate Officer | X |
|Approved by: | A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer | X |
A bylaw to amend District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987 by rezoning a property at 6317 Bligh Road from R-3 to R-1

WHEREAS the Council of the District of Sechelt deems it necessary to amend the District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987;

AND WHEREAS the proposed rezoning is consistent with Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 492, 2010;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Sechelt in open meeting assembled enacts as follows:

TITLE

This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987, Amendment Bylaw No. 25-289, 2018 (Everbrite Ventures)”.

PROVISIONS

1. That Lot B of DL 4293, Plan LMP28560 (PID 023-438-916), at 6317 Bligh Rd., as shown on the plan attached to and forming part of this bylaw as Schedule A be rezoned from R-3 (Residential 3) to R-1 (Residential 1).

2. That Schedule A of Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987 (Official Zoning Maps) be amended to reflect the zoning designation and boundaries brought into force by this bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME THIS 19th DAY OF December 2018
PUBLIC HEARING HELD THIS 17th DAY OF April 2019
READ A SECOND TIME THIS 5th DAY OF June 2019
READ A THIRD TIME THIS 5th DAY OF June 2019
APPROVED BY THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAYS THIS 13th DAY OF June 2019
THIRD READING RESCINDED THIS 20th DAY OF May 2020
PUBLIC HEARING WAIVED THIS 20th DAY OF May 2020
READ A THIRD TIME THIS DAY OF 2020
ADOPTED THIS DAY OF, 2020

Mayor

Corporate Officer
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Council

FROM: Manager of Financial Services

SUBJECT: Suncoast Racquet Club Lease Renewal

FILE NO: 2240-2020-16

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from, Manager of Financial Services, regarding Suncoast Racquet Club Lease Renewal be received.

2. That Council authorize a 20-year extension of the Suncoast Racquet Club lease and direct staff to bring forward the appropriate agreement to extend the term, for Council’s consideration.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to have Council consider a request from the Suncoast Racquet Club (Club) for a 20-year extension of their current lease.

OPTIONS

1. Endorse the above recommendations.
2. Council could defer the decision and request further information.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background

The Suncoast Racquet Club is requesting an extension to their existing 20-year lease with the District of Sechelt at the District’s property located at 6000 Lighthouse Ave.

The Suncoast Racquet Club’s current 20-year lease was signed in 2006. The lease term will complete in May 2026. The lease includes provisions to extend the length of the lease for a mutually agreed term. The terms from the lease includes:

“Subject to the terms and conditions of this Lease, the Tenant and Landlord, may, upon mutual written agreement, extend the length of this Lease after the initial term for a term mutually agreed to by the Landlord and Tenant.”

The Club is requesting the lease extension to obtain funding from Sunshine Coast Credit Union to refinance 2 long term member loans. The interest rate being offered is better than their
current rate, and the mortgage will permit a longer amortization period for the existing debt. This will improve their current cash flow, which will enable the club to enhance community services.

In June 2020, staff met with the Club to review the building and property. At the meeting, staff requested the landscaping be completed and cleaned up at the property before the lease is considered for extension. The club complied with the request, cleaned the property with volunteers and the result is a large improvement to the facilities curb appeal.

Below is a photo of the updated landscaping:

Further information about the Suncoast Racquet Club:
Suncoast Racquet Club provides community indoor tennis, (member, public play, coaching, youth, teen, adult senior, recreational and tournament playing) to the Sunshine Coast. Their facility welcomes all ages and skills groups. The Club has 3 tennis professionals who provide coaching to members, public and school programs. They are a member of Tennis BC.

The club has 100 members, 34% being Sechelt residents and is managed by 8 Directors, 100% being Sechelt residents.

For the past 2 years the Club has hosted the Hospice Suncoast Tennis tournament fundraiser weekend that has raised in excess of $65,000 for Hospice to date. (100% of the proceeds go to Hospice)

The Club provides all season, year around indoor tennis to the community. They provide community programming for all skill levels including delivery of Tennis Canada and Tennis BC programs. Public play is provided via drop-in, programs, lessons, and open tennis tournaments. The Club allocates 20% of available court time for public access to the facility. The Club continues
to work with area elementary and high schools to offer tennis programming and tennis club to Sechelt students.
Club members provide volunteer services to support the operation, maintenance, and programming for the club. The membership annually provides 2500 hours of volunteer time to support tennis and other community activities.

**Strategic Plan**
Strategic Priority 2, enhancing fiscal sustainability. The District focuses on fiscal sustainability of the municipality to ensure we can contribute to providing needed services and infrastructure.

**Financial Implications**
There are no financial implications directly associated with this report. The Suncoast Racquet Club pays one dollar as basic rent per year of the term. The club applies each year for a permissive tax exemption and Council provides the exemption of approximately $13,000 per year.

**Communications**
A Notice of Disposition of land will be posted to the District’s website and advertised in the local newspaper. Municipalities and regional districts are required to give public notice for the disposal of land or improvements. When a purchase agreement or lease is already in place, the notice must identify the property, the purchaser, the purchase price, and the nature and term of the disposition.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Currie
Manager of Financial Services

Attachments:

1. Letter Received from the Suncoast Racquet Club on May 27, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed by:</th>
<th>Approved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Rogers, Communications Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Frank, Corporate Officer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suncoast Racquet Club
Community Indoor Tennis
6000 Lighthouse Avenue
Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A5

District of Sechelt
2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie Street
Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A0

Re: Suncoast Racquet Club Lease Extension Request

Attention: Mr. Ben Currie – Manager of Financial Services

Date: 27-May-2020

Dear Sir

The Suncoast Racquet Club is requesting an extension to our existing 20 yr. lease with the District of Sechelt for our facility at 6000 Lighthouse Ave.

Our current 20-year lease was signed in 2006. The lease term will complete around May 2026. The lease includes provisions to extend the length of the lease for a mutually agreed term.

We discussed the lease extension with Jo-Anne Frank last Fall. She indicated at that time that the District was not receptive to rewriting the lease but would be receptive to adding a one-page addendum to add another 15 to 20 years to the lease.

We are requesting that the District approve a one-page addendum to our lease at your earliest convenience.

We are requesting the lease extension to obtain funding from Sunshine Coast Credit Union to refinance our 2 long term member loans. The interest rate being offered is better than our current rate, and a SCCU mortgage will permit a longer amortization period for the existing debt. This will improve our cash flow situation and enable us to continue our efforts as a community resource.

The longer lease period is a requirement of the Credit Union. They require the lease period to be at least 3 years longer than the amortization period.

Benefits to extending the lease period:

- A significant financial burden will be lifted off our members. This will allow the Club to slightly reduce the membership fees thus making it more accessible to the community to play tennis.
- Additional community programming will be available for the public and school programs
• Resources will be available to continue sponsoring community charity events such as the Hospice Tournament and Fundraiser that we have sponsored for the past 2 years. This event has raised more than $65,000 for Hospice at the 2 events we have hosted to date.

• Additional cash flow will enable the club to add outdoor courts that can be shared between the public and members. Sechelt expressed an interest several years ago to re-purpose the Hackett Park courts. This would provide that opportunity to keep public courts available in Sechelt, with maintenance and services being provided by the Club, freeing District resources from their upkeep.

We would like the extension at the earliest possible convenience as we believe the SCCU offer might be time limited.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or require clarification of our requirements.

Sincerely

Colin Jacobsen – President
Suncoast Racquet Club
604-741-2795
cjacobsen@designitcorp.ca

Cc: SRC Board
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Council

FROM: Planning Technician

SUBJECT: Development Variance Application for 5525 Trail Avenue (Sechelt Fire Protection District)

FILE NO: 3090-2020-04

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report from the Planning Technician regarding the Development Variance Permit application for 5525 Trail Avenue (Sechelt Fire Protection District) be received.

2. THAT Council approve the Development Variance Permit for 5525 Trail Avenue (Sechelt Fire Protection District).

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present for Council consideration of a development variance permit application for 5525 Trail Avenue. Sechelt Fire Protection District have applied to vary the District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987, to reduce the setback requirements to allow for an addition to the Fire Hall.

OPTIONS

1. That Council approve the Development Variance Permit application as presented.

2. That Council refer the Development Variance Permit application back to staff for revisions as directed.

3. That Council deny the Development Variance Permit application.

BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sechelt Volunteer Fire Department has operated in this location since 1982 when the building was first constructed. At that time, the Village of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 239, 1982 permitted the siting of the building. In more recent history, the property was the subject of an amendment to the OCP and zoning bylaw in April 2013.

Site and Surrounding Areas
The subject property is located in the Sechelt Village neighbourhood fronting on Trail Avenue. Surrounding land uses include residential, commercial, and public assembly.

Location & Site Characteristics

- Location Plan – See Attachment 1
- Site Plan – See Attachment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Surrounding Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Zoning

Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987 - Setbacks

The District of Sechelt Zoning Bylaw No. 25, 1987 establishes zones to regulate the use of land, buildings, and structures throughout the District. Table 3 outlines the bylaw requirements, the proposed changes, and the difference between what the bylaw permits and what the applicant has proposed with respect to the addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Setback Variance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this proposal, the reduction requested will allow for an addition to the west side of two vehicle bays and a modest addition on the south side to create additional storage. The proposed additions are 45.98 m² in area. The portion of the addition that is the subject of the variance is 11.02 m² in area.

The proposed reduction to the setback does not pose an issue with respect to the BC Building Code as the home to the west is approximately 30 metres away and the property to the south is undeveloped and the two properties are divided by Seiner Lane.
Strategic Plan
N/A

Policy Implications
N/A

Financial Implications
Application fee for the addition under Building Bylaw No. 409, 2003. Value to be determined based on the value of construction.

Communications
The Development Variance Permit application was subject to a statutory 100 m notification process ten days prior to the Council meeting deadline. Responses from notification will be considered and presented to Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Dalaire
Planning Technician

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Location Plan
Attachment 2 – Site Plan
Attachment 3 – Development Variance Permit 2020-04

Reviewed by: I. Holl, Development Planning Manager
Reviewed by: D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services
Reviewed by: J. Rogers, Communications Manager
Reviewed by: J. Frank, Corporate Officer
Approved by: A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer
1. This Development Variance Permit is issued to:
   
   (a) Sechelt Fire Protection District  
   5525 Trail Avenue  
   Sechelt, BC  
   V0N 3A0

2. This Development Variance Permit is issued subject to compliance with all the applicable Bylaws of the District of Sechelt except as specifically varied or supplemented by this Permit.

3. This Development Variance Permit applies to, and only to, the property within the District of Sechelt as described below, and all building structures and other developments thereon:
   
   Legal Description:
   
   Lot D, District Lot 303, Plan EPP8839, PID 028-362-632  
   Addressed as: 5525 Trail Avenue

4. Bylaws of the District enacted under Section 298(1)(j) and Section 479 of the Local Government Act, as amended from time to time, are varied or supplemented as described below.

   Zoning Bylaw 25, 1987 is varied for the property noted above to allow for an addition to the existing fire hall. The variance is as follows:

   (a) Vary section 1005 to reduce the setback requirement from 7.5m to 4.72m to allow for an addition as shown on Attachment 1.

5. The Property and the works shall be developed strictly in accordance with the following terms, conditions and provisions of this Development Variance Permit and any plans and specifications attached to this Development Variance Permit shall form part of this Development Variance Permit:

   (a) Attachment 1 - Site Plan
6. Notice of this permit shall be filed at the Land Titles Office under the authority of Section 503 of the *Local Government Act* and upon such filing, the terms of this permit or any amendment hereto shall be binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the lands affected by this permit.

**THIS DEVELOPMENT PERMIT IS NOT A BUILDING PERMIT.**

Authorizing Resolution of Council:
Resolution No:
Date of Resolution:
Date of Issue:

Authorizing Signature:

______________________________
Andrew Allen
Director of Planning & Development

Attachments:

- Attachment 1
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Communications Manager
SUBJECT: Engagement options regarding place name proposals for Wilson Creek
FILE NO: 0400-20

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from the communications manager regarding Engagement options regarding place name proposals for Wilson Creek be received.
2. That Council host a Community to Community meeting with shíshálh Nation to discuss the renaming.
3. That Council host an online meeting with members of the Selma Park/ Davis Bay/ Wilson Creek Community Association to discuss the renaming.
4. That Council direct staff to request an extension of the comment period to September 14, 2020 from the BC Geographical Names Office.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with community engagement options regarding the place name proposals for Wilson Creek neighbourhood and the Wilson Creek, the water body.

OPTIONS

1. That Council direct staff to distribute an online survey to Sechelt and Sunshine Coast residents.
2. That Council direct staff to commence some other forms of community survey or engagement.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is a document that describes both individual and collective rights of Indigenous peoples around the world. It offers guidance on cooperative relationships with Indigenous peoples to states, the United Nations, and other international organizations based on the principles of equality, partnership, good faith, and mutual respect.
In May 2016, the Minister of Indigenous and Northern Affairs announced Canada is now a full supporter, without qualification, of the declaration. In November 2019, the Province of BC signed on officially with the passing of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act.

In October 2018, the Province of BC and the shíshálh Nation signed a landmark reconciliation agreement which recognizes and respects Indigenous title and rights, and, supports self-determination and shíshálh self-government. This agreement includes a commitment to two important projects: one to identify significant geographical features and locations to be renamed with shíshálh place names; and another to install dual-language highway and road signage in appropriate locations.

Due in part to language suppression policies in residential school, the she shashishalhem (the traditional language spoken by the shíshálh people) has declined in use. For more than 40 years efforts have been made to preserve this important part of the shíshálh culture by encoding the oral language into written form.

On January 27, 2020 Council was sent a letter from the BC Geographical Names Office regarding the renaming of the Wilson Creek neighbourhood and the renaming of the creek named Wilson Creek. The BC Geographical Names Office received proposals from shíshálh Nation to change or adopt names for several geographical features in the shíshálh swiya/Sunshine Coast area. This project is important to the shíshálh Nation to protect and promote shíshálh culture, language, and history across the shíshálh swiya (world, birthplace, lands, “Territory”).

On April 25, 2020 Council passed the following motion:

“That Council Correspondence item No. 1, 03-26, Email, C. Jack, Comment Period Extension for Naming Proposal of Wilson Creek be referred to staff to provide Council with proposals on how to engage the community along with shíshálh Nation.”

Engagement options

1. Sechelt Council host a community to community meeting with shíshálh Nation Council to gain a better understanding of the foundation agreement and the importance of the projects.
2. Sechelt Council host a community meeting with members of the Selma Park/Davis Bay/ Wilson Creek Community Association to discuss the place name proposals.
3. District staff deliver letters to Wilson Creek businesses to inform them of the proposal and provide an opportunity to submit written comments.
4. District staff advertise on social media and the local newspaper to invite comments by email or mail from residents.
5. District staff provide an online survey for Sechelt and Sunshine Coast citizens to provide input.
6. District staff launch a Facebook poll.

While polls and surveys are an engagement option, they are not recommended due to the importance and complexity of the issue. An uninformed vote in a social media poll will not provide Council with meaningful insight.
Meaningful dialogue with specific stakeholders is warranted so that each participant can receive information about the project and the reasons for it before expressing an opinion.

At the conclusion of this project there is an opportunity to continue the engagement with information for the community that celebrates the language and culture of our indigenous neighbours on whose traditional unceded land we live and work.

**District of Sechelt implications**

The Wilson Creek neighbourhood does not have any specified geographic boundaries or signage. There would not be any changes needed to District signs, documents, materials, policies, or procedures as a result of a name change to the neighbourhood.

Wilson Creek is also the name of a creek. There would not be any changes needed to District signs, documents, materials, policies, or procedures as a result of a name change for the creek.

**Strategic Plan**

6.3 Providing opportunities for public participation in the decision-making process.
6.4 Pursuing federal reconciliation recommendations.

**Policy Implications**

N/A

**Financial Implications**

There may be cost associated with a community to community meeting depending on the format, but it will be covered by the Community to Community UBCM grant.

**Communications**

Communications will commence as directed by Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Rogers
Communications manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed by</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Allen, Director of Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Frank, Corporate Officer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 6, 2020

Mayor Siegers and Council
District of Sechelt
PO Box 129
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

Re:  SCCF Legacy Fund Committee Grant Recommendations

Dear Mayor and Council,

At two meetings of our Community Forest’s Legacy Fund Assessment Committee, applications totalling $3.4 millions were reviewed. As the unreserved Legacy Fund balance is $72,430 it is a challenging year for our Committee members.

At a meeting this morning, July 6th our Board of Directors approved the Committee’s following recommendations to the District of Sechelt, as sole Shareholder of Sechelt Community Projects Inc:

**Sunshine Coast Association for Community Living - COVID 19 Community Inclusion Support - $8,000**
The Sunshine Coast Association for Community Living supports some of our community’s most vulnerable members. During the first months of the current provincial state of emergency they experienced unprecedented need by their clients, and were in a position of being able to help due to their ongoing supportive relationship with these vulnerable individuals, but did not have the funds to do so. While life is starting to look more like normal for some of us, for many of their clients self-isolation continues with association staff being the only point of contact. This grant will help ensure that they are in a position to help keep their clients safe with food and secure housing in the months to come.

**Roberts Creek Community Association - Commercial Kitchen Upgrades - $7,000**
The Roberts Creek Community Association’s Roberts Creek Hall is a community hub which is very well used. The Hall kitchen is the only commercial kitchen in Roberts creek and in addition to food service provided at events, it is rented at a low cost to local small businesses and market attendees to prepare food for sale. Upgraded, efficient appliances for this kitchen will help make the community more food secure and be an asset during good times and during emergencies. This grant can pay for half of the cost of the appliances.

**St Bart’s Food Bank - Cold Storage and Client Shelter - $5,400**
The St Bart’s Food Bank is the only no-barrier food bank in our community, serving those who may not have or do not feel comfortable sharing their ID. They currently only distribute dry goods as they have no means of storing items requiring cold storage. The purchase of a fridge and freezer will allow them to expand their offerings to include more varied and nutritious goods such as fruits, vegetables and eggs, and to take advantage of sales on items that can be frozen, making their dollars stretch further. They also have need of tents to protect their clients and goods from the weather while they are having to operate outdoors due to the ongoing provincial health emergency.
Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society - Save Our Salmon - $40,000
The Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society has been operating a hatchery to build salmon stocks in our community for 18 years, additionally providing an important educational experience and a popular tourist attraction. Last year, they had to sell their stock to other hatcheries because they could not maintain conditions for their fish during the drought, with their only source of water being Chapman Creek. This grant will enable them to identify sites and drill 2 test wells, completing Phase 1. This is the first of a 2-Phase plan detailed in the application which would allow the hatchery to continue operations and reduce their impact on Chapman Creek. The Committee asks the District of Sechelt to consider funding the remaining $50,000 of this grant request out of the reserved Legacy Fund to ensure our local hatchery operation can continue.

Sunshine Coast Museum and Archives - Protecting Coastal History - $12,000
The Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives has long needed an HVAC retrofit to improve air circulation and humidity control to preserve their collection, but has put in place various manual stopgap measures to make do with the system in place. The ongoing pandemic has additionally raised concerns about recirculated air systems contributing to spread of viruses, putting them in the difficult position of having to close their doors, cutting off a significant revenue stream. This grant will cover improvements to their HVAC system which will allow them to protect visitors and their collections, and reopen.

A copy of each application is enclosed for your review and consideration. Please feel free to contact us if you have and questions about the submissions.

If approved by Council cheques are to be made payable as follows (amount granted less 10% holdback to be withheld):

| Sunshine Coast Society for Community Living | Roberts Creek Community Association |
| Box 165 Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0 | Box 261 Roberts Creek, BC V0N 2W0 |
| $7,200 | $6,300 |
| St Bart’s Food Bank | Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society |
| 659 North Rd | 4381 Parkway Drive |
| Gibsons, BC V0N 1V9 | Sechelt, BC V0N 3A1 |
| $4,860 | $81,000 |
| Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives | |
| Box 766 | |
| Gibson, BC V0N 1V0 | |
| $10,800 | |

We would ask that District of Sechelt staff please retain cheques for approved projects until a photo opportunity for recipients, Councillors and committee members is arranged.

Yours truly,  
SCCF LEGACY FUND ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Elise Rudland,  
Chair
# Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund

## Application for Funding

### Name of Project:

- Food and Housing Security Initiative

### Name of Organization:

- Sunshine Coast Association for Community Living

### Date of Application:

- June 29, 2020

### Total Funds Requested:

- 13,000

### Needs Statement:

**Why is project important? Who will benefit from this project? How will this project enhance the community?**

In the past 4 months, many of the vulnerable population we at SCACL support have been reliant on the staff as their only point of contact. The staff have been cooking 5 meals per week and ensuring our vulnerable population have some interaction throughout their day. While the slow re-opening has been successful in our beautiful community, we continue to be hesitant to support our clients to go to the grocery store and getting other day to day essentials as our "new normal" has been a hard concept for most of our clients to grasp. Most people are waiting for our community to "go back to the way it used to be." Our clients have been continuing to isolate for the majority of the time, so we feel it is essential to continue our food program to support our clients in food security, therefore alleviating finances and helping maintain secure housing. While the food security is the main concern, mental health is our secondary concern. Having a daily interaction with another person, someone who they know and trust, has proven to be an essential need during this time. While our world has stopped, the needs of our clients have not. A large barrier for many of our population is the need to be prompted to remain socially distant. While our community is quite understanding under normal circumstances, during this time there is definitely a potential for discrimination to be increased. We hope to alleviate our clients anxiety around this, as well as our fellow community members’ anxiety.

In conclusion, we hope this will benefit the community to keep our vulnerable population safe, with food and secure housing, in addition to providing some social contact. This will also prevent further spread if there is another outbreak.

### Project Description (attach separate page if necessary):

**What are the goals? How will they be achieved?**

**How does the project meet the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria? Include a timeline for the project. Be as precise as possible. If possible, include measurements of success and long-term viability.**

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the main goal is to keep the vulnerable population safe with secure food and housing. The meal programs were implemented as there was an identified need to keep our clients safe with food while remaining socially isolated. Rather than risk exposing themselves and others to COVID19, they can remain in their home and continue to have person to person contact. This is the ultimate goal for continuing to keep our vulnerable population safe, as well as our community safe.

At this point, our plan is to continue our meal program until the end of the summer. We will be revisiting the programs needs at the end of the summer depending on where the pandemic control needs are. BC’s re opening plan has been successful, however, there is the concern of another potential outbreak.

Presently we are serving 13 people who are isolated and have little to no family contact within the Sunshine Coast. We are their primary point of contact for socialization, food supply, assistance with groceries, and other basic needs of survival. The population we serve are individuals with diverse abilities, pre-existing underlying health conditions (diabetes, heart disease, obesity).
**Budget:**

Include total anticipated costs, quotes from contractors, other sources of funding (including your organization's funds) and how much you are requesting from the SCCF Legacy Fund.

At present, we are spending on average $273 per week on groceries and $15 per week on other essential needs as they come. Examples of non food essential purchases that have been made are thermometers, disinfectant, Ginger ale (stomach bug), toilet paper & soap. Beginning July 6th, 2020, the food initiative program will be subletting a space out of St. Hilda’s church. The estimated budget will be a minimum of $480 (2 days per week) per month to a maximum (5 days per week) $2,400 for the kitchen usage. The budget does not include staffing and vehicle usage. The funding source for those come directly from Community Living British Columbia, our primary source of funding. Total Cost Estimated cost for the food from July to August is $3,264. Our hope is to obtain funding in preparation for the remainder of the year in the event that there is another outbreak. Our budget below will include the amount it will cost for the next 6-9 months depending on facility rental needs.

**Monthly Budget:**
- Food: $1,092
- Non food essential: $80
- Facility Rental (current): $480
- Total: $1,652
- 6-9 month projected cost: $14,688

---

**Additional Information:**

---

**Contact Information:**

**Name:** Gabrielle Pape/ Clarence Li  
**Phone Number(s):** [REDACTED]  
**Mailing Address:**  
BOX 165 SECHLT, BC VON 3A0  
**E-mail:** gpape@scaci.ca

Applicants confirm that, should funding be provided, they will undertake to acknowledge on all promotional materials associated with the program/project, the funding provided by the Legacy Fund and agree to be featured in SCCF's annual report, subject to applicable privacy considerations, at SCCF's discretion.

---

**Authorized Signature:**  
**Date:** June 29, 2020

Submit completed application to legacyfund@scf.ca or PO Box 215, C - 5588 Inlet Avenue, Sechelt BC, VON 3A0  
Call 604-885-7809 for more information

---

Regular Council Meeting Agenda - AMENDED  
July 15, 2020  
Page 64
## Needs Statement:

Why is project important? Who will benefit from this project? How will this project enhance the community?

The Roberts Creek Hall offers the only commercial kitchen in Roberts Creek. The RCCA would like to upgrade the outdated and inefficient original kitchen in order to provide a clean, safe, and efficient community commercial kitchen. We seek to install an energy-efficient oven and fridge, and to provide stainless steel worktables, double sinks, lockable storage space, and easily cleanable walls and floors. We have quotes and estimates on hand and are ready to proceed with this exciting project.

A well-designed commercial community kitchen would permit the RCCA to better provide disaster/crisis relief. The recent Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for our community to be able to provide food to our most vulnerable members. The RCCA plans to partner with the One Straw Society to offer a community kitchen program and to host community food-security events such as food preparation and preservation workshops. The Hall kitchen is used by local microproducers to prepare food for sale at the Hall's weekly farmer's market. It is also used by local chefs to prepare dinners that are then made available for take-out. We rent the kitchen at an affordable price so that local small business owners can be successful. An upgraded kitchen would allow food entrepreneurs and caterers to have a space in which to prepare food 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

A functional kitchen would also increase the RCCA's capacity to host meetings, banquets, community forums, and fairs. The RCCA proudly supports local food culture and food spaces on the Sunshine Coast. We believe that a strong food culture and local food systems that connect everyone are key.

## Project Description (attach separate page if necessary):

What are the goals? How will they be achieved?

How does the project meet the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria? Include a timeline for the project. Be as precise as possible. If possible, include measurements of success and long-term viability.

Please see the attached document, titled, "Project Description."
**Budget:**
Include total anticipated costs, quotes from contractors, other sources of funding (including your organization’s funds) and how much you are requesting from the SCCF Legacy Fund.

Total anticipated costs for energy-efficient wall oven, fridge, stainless-steel worktables, double sink and faucets, nonslip flooring, wipeable wall covering, storage (to be purchased from ABM Food Equipment, Vancouver; https://abmfoodequipment.com/) - $14,000

Labour: $6000 (Please see attached quote)

Potential other sources of funds: $25,000 FCC AgriSpirit Fund (award notification scheduled for August 2020)

Total requested from the SCCF Legacy Fund: $20,000

---

**Additional Information:**

---

**Contact Information:**

Name: Karen Spicer

Mailing Address:
PO Box 261, Roberts Creek Road, Roberts Creek, BC V0N 2W0

Phone Number(s):

E-mail:

---

Applicants confirm that, should funding be provided, they will undertake to acknowledge on all promotional materials associated with the program/project, the funding provided by the Legacy Fund and agree to be featured in SCCF’s annual report, subject to applicable privacy considerations, at SCCF’s discretion.

Karen Spicer
Authorized Signature

June 22, 2020
Date
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**Project Description**

The goals of this project are to establish a strong community food system and food culture that will benefit residents of the Sunshine Coast by improving community education, social connections, culture sharing, skills and leadership training, and access to healthy food. We also aim to assist food entrepreneurs on the Sunshine Coast by providing increased opportunities to run a small business or host catered events at the Hall. These goals will be achieved through the thoughtful design and implementation of a community kitchen and through active partnership with the One Straw Society.

This project aligns fully with the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria. The RCCA is a well-respected and financially sustainable non-profit society that has worked diligently since 1958 to serve its community. There is a demonstrated level of community support for the kitchen renovation, as shown by good volunteer attendance and input at project planning meetings and the full engagement and support of One Straw Society (who recently partnered with Vancouver Coastal Health). An efficient and well-designed kitchen will become a community asset that will be used by many members of the community as they learn to can jam grown down the street at One Straw’s new Tiny Farm or as they learn to ferment their own sauerkraut, when they pick up take-out food produced by a local chef, and when they enjoy catered conferences and events. We want the kitchen to be enjoyed by EVERYONE: children, youth, families, seniors, indigenous people, LGBTQ2S+ folks, marginalized people, people with disabilities, and people of all abilities, ethnicities, and religions.

We are ready to proceed with this project, and have been planning it for a few years. In light of the Covid-19 pandemic, our Hall is closed and it is therefore an ideal time to carry out major renovations. We can confirm that all funds awarded will be put towards this capital project, and not for planning, administration, or routine operational expenses. The majority of the contractors who have quoted on the project are from the Sunshine Coast, or have local workers. Hiring local workers, contractors, and manufacturers wherever possible is a priority for the RCCA.

We have also applied for $25,000 funding for this project through the FCC AgriSpirit Fund, and will learn the results of our application in August. It is our hope to combine funds in order to carry out an effective kitchen renovation. Should funding be provided, the RCCA will
acknowledge on all promotional materials associated with the project the funding provided by the Legacy Fund, and agrees to be featured in SCCF’s annual report, at SCCF’s discretion.

Roberts Creek Community Hall 85th Anniversary Community Photo – 2019

**Project Timeline**
The project will take approximately three months to complete.

**Project start date:** September 1, 2020  
**Project completion date:** January 31, 2021

**Key milestones:**
September 1-10 - Dismantle current kitchen.  
December 10 to 31 – Finish venting, plumbing and electrical work.  
January 1-31 – Final finishing.
**External factors that could affect the timeline:**
A surge in the number of Covid-19 cases that results in enhanced social distancing measures may slow the renovation timeline down. We will adjust as needed in order to stay safely within the guidelines advised by our provincial health authority. Masks and sanitizer will be provided for all workers, and a safety protocol will be established before the kitchen renovation proceeds. We have already been in touch with the Health Inspector to seek guidance on the renovation.

**Measurements of Success**

The Hall kitchen is used by local microproducers to prepare food for sale at the Hall’s much-loved and fabulous weekly farmer’s market. It is also used by local chefs to prepare dinners that are then made available for take-out. We rent the kitchen at an affordable price so that local small business owners can be successful. Unfortunately, the current kitchen is poorly designed and outdated. An upgraded kitchen would allow more food entrepreneurs to have a space in which to prepare food 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This would benefit these small business owners and would also benefit the community that gets to try new and delicious locally prepared food. An increase in the number of kitchen rentals would be a measurable benefit.

The kitchen is not currently suitable for catered food preparation as there is insufficient fridge, counter, oven, and freezer space. There is also no secure storage space for regular users. An upgrade would benefit local caterers as it would allow them to rent this space for food preparation during the very busy summer wedding season. A functional kitchen would also benefit the Hall by increasing its capacity to host meetings, banquets, community forums, and fall fairs. An increase in the number of rentals and Hall visits would be a measurable benefit.

The RCCA hosts a free Christmas Day community potluck that regularly welcomes over 200 guests. Volunteers currently cook all of the turkeys and stuffing off-site; it would be wonderful to be able to cook everything in our own kitchen. An increase in the number of guests at our annual Christmas potluck would be a measurable benefit.
The RCCA proudly supports local food culture and food spaces on the Sunshine Coast. We believe that a strong food culture and local food systems that connect everyone are key parts of a healthy community. Our current weekly kitchen rentals include “Seoul Kitchen” (homestyle Japanese/Korean food) made by a Japanese mother and daughter and “Curry in the Creek” (homestyle curries served here for more than ten years! See http://www.curryinthe creek.com/) made by an Indian woman. These local businesses celebrate cultural diversity and culture sharing and enable local families to regularly try healthy new foods. An increase in the number of local food businesses that use the kitchen would be a third measurable benefit.

A well-designed commercial community kitchen would permit the RCCA to offer a community kitchen program or to host community food-security events such as food preparation and preservation workshops. An increase in the number of food-security-related events would be a measurable benefit of great interest to us.
May 15, 2020

To: Roberts Creek Community Association
Karen Spicer, RCCA Vice President

Commercial kitchen structural renovations at Roberts Creek Hall.
Modification and renovation of the existing kitchen space at the RC Hall.
(Electrical and plumbing costs will vary with the chosen design.)
Total estimate: $6000
Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund
Application for Funding

Name of Project: St. Bart's Food Bank "Cold Storage & Client Shelter" Project
Name of Organization: St. Bart's Food Bank
Date of Application: June 30, 2020
Total Funds Requested: $5,516.00 ($4,925 expenses + $591.00 taxes)

**Needs Statement:**

Why is project important? Who will benefit from this project? How will this project enhance the community?

This St. Bart's Food Bank project is important because it offers concrete/practical support to some of the most vulnerable people in our community. Those who will benefit from the project are people in our community who experience food insecurity and who may be homeless or at risk of homelessness. Many of our clients are seniors.

This project will enhance the health of the vulnerable in our community by expanding our current Food Bank offerings to include fresh, perishable, nutritious foods. It will also offer shelter to our clients while attending the Food Bank during periods of inclement weather. In 2020, the St. Bart's Food Bank served 60 to 100 clients per month and provided food for 85 to 200 people.

Expansion of our Food Bank offerings in a safe, sheltered environment will enhance the network of "social capital" in the lower Sunshine Coast; i.e., it will improve the existing network of "food support" to persons experiencing challenging circumstances. As noted by authors Mechanic and Tanner (healthaffairs.org) "...attention to vulnerable groups not only assists their life challenges but contributes more generally to the safety and quality of life of the entire community."

**Project Description (attach separate page if necessary):**

What are the goals? How will they be achieved?

How does the project meet the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria? Include a timeline for the project. Be as precise as possible. If possible, include measurements of success and long-term viability.

The goals of this project are:

1. To expand the capacity of our current Food Bank operations to be able to regularly offer fresh fruit, vegetables, eggs and other perishable food items that require cold storage.
2. To provide shelter to our clients, our products and our volunteers (in our out-door setting) during inclement weather.

The first goal will be achieved through purchase of a refrigerator and freezer. We would like to be able to take advantage of sale prices on selected items, such as bread, that can be frozen and distributed to clients at a later date. We have the physical space to accommodate the appliances.

The second goal will be achieved through purchase of three canopies: one for clients, one for food hampers and one for volunteers. We anticipate continuing to hold our Food Bank out of doors throughout 2020 and 2021 in order to continue to minimize the spread of COVID-19. At the present time, we have to borrow "pop-up" tents to use for our Food Bank.

This project addresses the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria of upgrading our Food Bank facilities for use by our Food Bank clients for years to come. The St. Bart's Food Bank is a "no-barrier" Food Bank; i.e., every person is welcome without the need to show any identification or proof of residency. The items purchased for this project will be a long term benefit to our community.

Once funding is approved, the items will be purchased and put to use immediately! The anticipated timeline for the project is July and August 2020. Measurements for success include:

- maintaining the current numbers of current clients during periods of inclement weather, especially during winter months
- increasing the number of clients fed by 10% over a one year period by expanding our offerings to include perishable foods.
**Budget:**

Include total anticipated costs, quotes from contractors, other sources of funding (including your organization’s funds) and how much you are requesting from the SCCF Legacy Fund.

**St. Bart’s Food Bank “Cold Storage & Client Shelter” Project - Proposed Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Top (Metal) Gazebo</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>Home Hardware (Local Vendor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lite “Pop-up” Canopy (two)</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Canadian Tire (Local Vendor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant 14cu Glass Door Cooler</td>
<td>$1,725.00</td>
<td>Paragon Food Equip (Vancouver Vendor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Upright Freezer</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>Rona (Local Vendor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,925.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items required to implement this project are detailed above. All prices have been published in local newspapers or on-line.

The financial request to the SCCF is $4,925.00 plus applicable taxes for a total of $5,516.00.

The St. Bart’s Food Bank directs all of it’s donations towards the purchase of food and household/personal supplies for clients, therefore we have requested a Legacy Grant for these capital expenditures.

**Additional Information:**

The St. Bart’s Food Bank has been in operation since 2010. We are staffed entirely by volunteers and the church pays all of our overhead expenses. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to submit an application to the Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund for these capital expenses.

**Contact Information:**

Name: Pamela McElheran

Mailing Address: St. Bart's Food Bank, 659 Norh Rd., Gibsons, BC V0N 1V9

Phone Number(s): [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Applicants confirm that, should funding be provided, they will undertake to acknowledge on all promotional materials associated with the program/project, the funding provided by the Legacy Fund and agree to be featured in SCCF’s annual report, subject to applicable privacy considerations, at SCCF’s discretion.

Pamela McElheran

June 30, 2020

Authorized Signature: [Redacted]

Date: [Redacted]

Submit completed application to legacyfund@sccf.ca or PO Box 215, C - 5588 Inlet Avenue, Sechelt BC, V0N 3A0

Call 604-885-7809 for more information
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Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund
Application for Funding

Name of Project:

Name of Organization:
Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society

Date of Application:
June 30, 2020

Total Funds Requested:

Needs Statement:
Why is project important? Who will benefit from this project? How will this project enhance the community?

The Chapman Creek Hatchery is owned and operated by the Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society, a non-profit organization dedicated to sustaining and building salmon stocks on the Sunshine Coast. The Chapman Creek Hatchery has been in operation since 1992 and has produced millions of salmon (Chinook, Coho, Chum, and Pink) and previously reared trout (Cutthroat and Steelhead) for release in local streams and lakes. It is a tourist attraction, education centre, summer camp for children and provides an environmental benefit for the community through public education regarding salmonid habitat and life cycles. The hatchery offers a unique experience with nature trails, local plants and safe viewing areas for the public.

Project Description (attach separate page if necessary):
What are the goals? How will they be achieved?
How does the project meet the Legacy Fund Evaluation Criteria? Include a timeline for the project. Be as precise as possible. If possible, include measurements of success and long-term viability.

Goals:
The Chapman Creek hatchery is run by both volunteers and previously two fulltime staff however as a result of Covid 19 there is only one fulltime paid hatchery manager on staff. The Chapman Creek hatchery is seeking $30,000 of financial support to assist in the continued investigation and installation of test and production wells.

The goal of the project is to establish an alternative water source to be used during summer periods when water restrictions are imposed. Currently the hatchery is serviced 100 percent by Chapman Creek with no emergency back up water source in place. During the summer months the flow rate of the Chapman rate is reduced to conserve water and the flow rate is potentially inadequate for the Coho on site.
This will be a two phase project. The first phase will be drill a 2 test wells on property adjacent to the hatchery. The second phase should the flow and source be adequate would be complete two production wells to service the hatchery during the summer months when water restrictions are in place or as an emergency back up source in the case of the intake pipe becomes plugged.
The SCSES is seeking a solution to the water by sourcing an alternative water source from the Aquifer.

Evaluation criteria
The project is aligned with the Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Bylaws. The hatchery will continue to be an asset to the community as a attraction and destination for local fishers and nature tours.
The well investigation project was initiated in 2019 through a hydrological study conducted by GW Solutions to determine the current water location and flow on site. The report became an important document used in future meetings with various federal and provincial government bodies. The hydrological report tested the current wells and proposed that a future test well should be pursued on the adjacent property owned by the Sunshine Coast Gun club. Accordingly, the SCSES have approached the Gun club and received a understanding that the SCSES have approval to pursue and drill a well on the Gun club property as recommended by the GW Solutions report. The Gun club is receptive to a well on gun club property as this could be used in an emergency in the case of a fire. The location is would be further from the creek so a to have less or no effect on the creek.
The measurement of success will be determined based on the flow rate from the future test well and ultimately the production wells to be drilled after.
Budget:
Include total anticipated costs, quotes from contractors, other sources of funding (including your organization’s funds) and how much you are requesting from the SCCF Legacy Fund.

We have attached two budgets quotes received supporting the funds required. The amount ranges based on the scope. We had originally applied for $35,000 however based on the recent quotes we will be seeking $90,000 representing ¾ of the required funds for two production wells. It is the SCSES intention to continue the installation of a well to support the enhancement of the salmon on the sunshine coast.

The budget reflects the installation of test and production wells based on the first and second phase of the project. Should the flow be adequate, it would be the SCSES intention to seek future funding for the production wells.

Required:
1. Seek the assistance of a lawyer to draft an agreement with the Gun Club to permit the drilling of a well and future use of the property. Estimated to be $1,500
2. To drill 2 test wells and flow rates. Quotes attached.

Additional Information:
We have attached a letter from the Gun Club supporting the investigation of a well and will be formalizing a legal agreement of understanding should we receive funding to proceed with test wells.

Contact Information:
Name: Simon Grant/Stephen Boale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address:</th>
<th>Phone Number(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4381 Parkway Drive, Sechelt, BC, V0N 3A1</td>
<td>(604) 885-4136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-mail: admin@scsalmon.org

Applicants confirm that, should funding be provided, they will undertake to acknowledge on all promotional materials associated with the program/project, the funding provided by the Legacy Fund and agree to be featured in SCCF’s annual report, subject to applicable privacy considerations, at SCCF’s discretion.

Authorized Signature: [Signature]
Date: June 30, 2020

Submit completed application to legacyfund@sccf.ca or PO Box 215, C - 5588 Inlet Avenue, Sechelt BC, V0N 3A0
Call 604-885-7809 for more information
Sunshine Coast Salmon Enhancement Society  
4381 Parkway Dr.  
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A1. 
(Via email)

Attention: Stephen Boale

Re: Groundwater exploration program - drilling and testing of test wells and production wells

We are pleased to present our proposal for a groundwater exploration program to find a reliable water supply source for the Chapman Creek hatchery. We understand that the present document is a part of an application form for the Sunshine Coast Legacy Fund.

GW Solutions understands that the hatchery needs to have access to a reliable groundwater supply source(s), specifically during the summer months when it cannot use the surface water intake on Chapman Creek because the water flow drops below 200 L/s. GW Solutions completed a preliminary hydrogeological investigation on the hatchery well field from May to July 2019. As a part of the study, four existing wells in the well field were surveyed. Two of the wells are currently unused, one well is used for drinking water (Well#1) and the other well (Well#4) is used for the fish hatchery water supply. The water demand for the hatchery is 600 US gpm. Based on the preliminary study, the current wells’ capacity cannot meet the demand and it is unlikely that only one well can produce enough water. Therefore, we propose to design a groundwater exploration program in order to assess multiple locations for drilling production wells.

GW Solutions understands that the Sunshine Coast Salmon Enhancement Society has permission to drill water wells within the adjacent property called the Gun Club.
The objectives of GW Solutions’ work include:

- Desktop and site visit studies to determine appropriate location(s) which are likely productive;
- Assessing the chosen location(s) by drilling test well(s) and conducting pumping test(s);
- Providing a detailed work plan for drilling, construction and testing of the test well(s);
- Supervising the drilling, completion and testing of the proposed test well(s);
- Analyzing the results of drilling logs and pumping test data to determine the best locations for drilling production well(s);
- Supervising the drilling, completion and testing of the proposed production well(s);
- Collecting water samples and interpreting the results;
- Completing the hydrogeological analyses (i.e. safe yield, aquifer properties, water quality, etc.) required by the different regulatory entities (Health Authority and FrontCounter BC); and
- Preparing hydrogeological reports and assisting with the application for a Groundwater Licensing Amendment to FrontCounter BC. The report will include a preliminary assessment of the possible connection of groundwater to Chapman Creek.

1 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

GW Solutions proposes completing the following tasks in two phases:

Phase 1) Groundwater exploration program which includes a desktop study, planning/designing/supervising drilling two test wells and conducting pumping tests to determine the best location to drill the production water well(s).

Phase 2) Planning/designing/supervising drilling production well(s), conducting pumping test(s) to assess the productivity of the well(s) and aquifer, safe yields, well interference by other water wells and surface water quality assessment.
1.1  Phase 1) Groundwater Exploration Program

1.1.1  Task 1 and Task 2 – Kick-off Meeting, Preliminary Site Visit, Desktop Study

GW Solutions is already familiar with the site (GW Solutions, July 2019); we will review in more detail to find the best location for drilling test wells. The level loggers that were installed in the existing wells will be downloaded to assess the amplitude of the groundwater fluctuation over a year.

GW Solutions will have a meeting with the client to go over the plan and finalize the work plan.

GW Solutions will recommend the best location for conducting a groundwater exploration program, considering:

- Land availability (gun club);
- Drill rig accessibility;
- Easing future connection to the existing water supply system;
- Regulatory setbacks;
- Well interference;
- Aquifer thickness; the thicker and deeper the aquifer, the larger the transmissivity and the available water column. As these two parameters are critical in the rating of a well, GW Solutions will estimate where on the available land we can optimize them;
- Potential impact from other users, surface water body (Chapman Creek) or other sources of contamination;
- GW Solutions will recommend a safe distance from the well where the aquifer is likely not affected by biofouling. The presence of clouds of bacteria in the bio-fouled zones typically result in 1) clogging of the pores and therefore a reduction in permeability/transmissivity of the aquifer and 2) a degradation of the water quality because the bacteria are associated with the oxidation or reduction of parameters; and
- GW Solutions will conduct a site visit with the client at and around the existing well locations to confirm the hydrogeological setting, rig accessibility, regulatory setbacks and determine the optimum well location(s).
1.1.2 Task 3 – Groundwater Exploration Program- Drilling Test Wells

1.1.2.1 Field planning for drilling

GW Solutions will prepare detailed tasks and a schedule for a qualified well driller to drill, complete and develop two 6” diameter test wells. The detailed tasks would include:

- Locations to drill;
- Aquifer materials to be drilled;
- Expected completion depth;
- Expected water depth and yield;
- Type of drilling method;
- Anticipated screen size and length; and
- Development method(s).

Once we confirm approval to proceed, we will coordinate a preliminary site visit with the drillers to confirm the location and discuss logistics (e.g., accessibility of the drill rig, safety, etc.).

1.1.2.2 Drilling program and supervision

GW Solutions will coordinate schedules and will directly supervise the drilling of the test wells, which will consist of:

- Providing directions to the contractor;
- Visually analyzing soil samples and conducting material sampling for laboratory sieve analyses;
- Observing water bearing formations and yield while drilling;
- Verifying construction is in compliance with federal and provincial regulations for constructing test wells;
• Designing the screen size and length;
• Monitoring the wells’ development procedure;
• Installing level loggers in the wells to continuously monitor water level fluctuation; and
• Preliminary reporting on observations and completed tasks.

Note: for cost estimate purposes, GW Solutions has assumed that the wells to be drilled are completed in a sand and gravel aquifer to a depth of approximately 50 m (150 ft).

1.1.3 Task 4 – Groundwater Exploration Program-Pumping test

1.1.3.1 Field planning for pumping test

GW Solutions will plan and design the pumping test program, which will consist of:

• Determining the rate(s) and duration of pumping and depth of pump based on the drilling results;
• Determining where the water will be discharged;
• Coordinating schedules and giving specifications to the contractor retained to perform the pumping test; and
• Coordinating with the laboratory for water quality analyses and submitting a water sample.

1.1.3.2 Pumping test supervision and water quality monitoring

GW Solutions will directly supervise the pumping test. It will consist of:

• Programming the level loggers in the wells;
• Programming the level loggers and installing them at the observation locations;
• Installing and programming a multi-parameter probe (YSI) that will continuously record temperature, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, salinity, pH, and dissolved oxygen of the pumped water;
• Providing directions and maintaining communication with the contractor at the beginning, during and at the end of pumping; and

• Collecting a water sample at the end of the pumping test and sending it to an accredited laboratory for essential package analysis.

1.1.4 Task 5 and Task 6 – Reporting and Updating Scope of Work for Phase 2

GW Solutions will interpret the data and prepare a brief hydrogeological report presenting the following:

• Description of completed work;

• Description of the physical and hydrogeologic setting;

• Description of aquifer characteristics;

• New test well as-built characteristics and yield; and

• Water quality results.

Outcome: The completed study will provide information regarding the presence and characteristics of the aquifer(s) (e.g., type, thickness, groundwater regime, groundwater quality, connection with Chapman Creek). The information gained through completion and testing of the test wells will allow us to project what a production well or a series of production well(s) (i.e., a well field) could safely produce, and their optimum location(s), taking into account interference between wells, interconnection with surface water, risk of contamination (e.g. proximity to gas station, highway, etc.), and development cost (connection to infrastructure), etc.

The cost estimate for Phase 1 is provided in Table 1; the cost includes estimates from drilling contractor.
1.2 Phase 2) Drilling and Testing Production Well(s)

1.2.1 Task 1 – Kick-off Meeting

GW Solutions will present the conclusions of Phase 1 (Groundwater Exploration Program) and provide the plan and schedule for performing Phase 2. We assume that the kick-off meeting for Phase 2 will be held as a conference call.

1.2.2 Task 2 – Inferring Locations for Production Well(s) and its Specifications

GW Solutions will determine the location of drilling production wells. The specifications of the proposed production wells are subject to be defined/revised based on the Phase 1 findings and will include.

- Well diameter; we have requested quotes for 12” diameter wells. One of the key design parameters is the entrance velocity (the speed at which groundwater enters the well screen). The lower the entrance velocity, the lower the energy loss, and the lower the change of pressure that controls the de-gassing of dissolved gases that drive bacteria growth and biofouling. A larger diameter well results in lower entrance velocity for a given production rate.
- Casing material;
- Expected completion depth is around 50 m;
- Expected water depth and yield;
- Type of drilling method (may be left open);
- Anticipated screen size and length; the screen length will be pre-designed assuming a well yield and a screen entrance velocity not exceeding 3 cm/s (see comment on the importance of having a low entrance velocity above);
- Surface seal specifications;
- Development method(s): we will probably recommend the following sequence: 1) bailing sediments accumulated at the bottom of the screen, 2) combined airlifting and water jetting, and 3) short pumping test to monitor the progress of development. This sequence will be repeated using increasing levels of pressure and stopped when little to no fines are observed passing the screen, no reduction in drawdown is observed, and the graded zone has reached a certain distance. Based on our experience, this has proven to be the most time and cost-effective way of
developing wells for the aquifers in the area. We will ask contractors to describe the equipment they will use (including compressor specs) and their hourly cost. Development is a critical step in completing a production well. It is very often overlooked because it happens last and because its cost can represent a significant part of the overall cost of well completion.

- Wellhead completion type; we will make sure the well head completion will 1) meet the regulations and 2) be designed to facilitate future connection to the existing system.

### 1.2.3 Task 3 – Well Drilling Program

#### 1.2.3.1 Planning and supervision

GW Solutions will coordinate schedules and will directly supervise the drilling of the production well(s), which will consist of:

- Providing directions to the contractor;

- Visually analyzing and describing soil samples; we will likely collect a sample representative of 1.5 m long sections or where changes in stratigraphy are observed. We take pictures of the soil samples, as well as a “Johnson” field template sheet that provides soil diameter scales to help in characterizing soil samples. This regular collection of samples will be instrumental in logging the well and making recommendations on where the screen should be located and its design;

- Observing water bearing formations, water levels and well yield while drilling; and

- Collecting soil samples for sieve analyses; we will submit soil samples for grain size analyses for the zones targeted for screen installation and for the soil layers above and below these zones. This is done to size the opening of the slots in the screen sections so that the aquifer material remains stable and does not produce sand when the well is put into operation.

#### 1.2.3.2 Screen design

Screen design and the optimization of well development was the subject of Dr. Gilles Wendling’s Ph.D. research. GW Solutions has developed methods and a level of detail for screen design that are not commonly practiced by other hydrogeological firms.
GW Solutions will design the screen assembly based on the information collected during drilling of the production well, and grain size analyses from collected aquifer samples. A properly designed screen assembly will save energy costs, provide maximum yield rate and will minimize problems with water quality (turbidity, well biofouling, etc.).

As discussed above, we want to maintain an entrance velocity below 3 cm/s. The screen length will be calculated based on this criterion.

Additionally, the size of the slot needs to be as large as possible to allow free flow of the groundwater, to allow removal of the fines near the screen (during development of the well) so that the aquifer material next to the screen is as permeable as possible and to minimize energy loss during operation. This energy efficiency directly translates into pumping cost (energy required to operate the pump).

The slots need to be small enough to maintain the mechanical integrity of the well, preventing fines from flowing into the well (i.e., wells producing sand). We use stability tests, rating the filtering capacity of coarser layers located adjacent to finer layers, and rating the size of the screen slots to stabilize aquifer material.

1.2.3.3 Well completion and development

GW Solutions will coordinate with drilling contractors the ordering and shipping of the well screen. GW Solutions will verify the screen dimensions upon reception and supervise the installation.

The production well will be developed with the following objectives:

- Restore the aquifer characteristics (remove “cake” or zones of the aquifer that would potentially be deteriorated during drilling);
- Remove the fines in the aquifer next to the screen in order to optimize groundwater flow towards the screen and reduce turbidity;
- Optimize the safe yield of the well; and
- Reduce the cost of operating the well.

As discussed above, we recommend that development methods include bailing, water jetting combined with airlifting, and pumping.
We will measure the quantity of fines removed following each step of development. We will also conduct “mini” pumping tests (typically lasting 20 to 30 minutes) to quantify the reduction of the drawdown, and therefore the improvement in specific capacity after several cycles of development. This will guide us in estimating the progress in development and when we should stop development.

We recommend that development be completed by gradually increasing the energy released during development. This has the benefit of reducing the risk of damage of the screen by preventing the creation of hydraulic gradients that could deform the screen. This gradual increase of energy also allows to increase the diameter of the developed zone around the well. The fines are first removed closer to the screen; their removal creates larger pores that allow the migration of fines located at a larger distance from the screen. A properly designed and developed well will allow the creation of an annulus around the well where large pores exist, and where all the fines and small particles have been removed.

Finally, GW Solutions will verify that the well is constructed in compliance with the BC Groundwater Protection Regulation (i.e. surface seal, wellhead, etc.).

We will discuss with the client the adequacy of installing a data logger to start recording the fluctuation of the water table after completion of the well.

### 1.2.4 Task 4 – Pumping Tests and Water Quality Analysis

GW Solutions will coordinate, schedule, and give final specifications to the contractor retained to perform the pumping tests based on the observations made during drilling and well completion (Task 3) and pumping tests on the test wells. We will also coordinate with the laboratory for water quality analyses and water sample reception.

GW Solutions will directly supervise the pumping test(s), comprising of a step test followed by a constant rate pumping test (likely 24-h). It will consist of:

- Programming of level logger(s) and installing in the new production well(s);
- Programming of level loggers in selected observations wells (the other wells in the wellfield);
- Confirming that the discharge location of the pumped water will not impact the results of the pumping test;
- Confirming that the discharged water will not negatively impact neighbours, surface water receptors, or the environment;
• Installing and programming a multi-parameter probe (YSI) that will continuously record temperature, electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, salinity, pH, and dissolved oxygen of the pumped water;

• Providing directions and maintaining communication with the contractor at the beginning, during and at the end of pumping; and

• Collecting a water sample at the end of the constant rate pumping test and sending it to an accredited laboratory for complete essential package analysis.

1.2.5 Task 5, Task 6 and Task 7– Reporting on Drilling and Pumping Test (Memo), Data Interpretation and Water Quality Assessment

GW Solutions will interpret the data and prepare a memo summarizing the following:

• Description of methodology (well location, screen design, yield);

• Description of completed work;

• New production well(s) as-built characteristics;

• Estimated well interference;

• Safe yield of the new production well, according to BC guidelines;

• Aquifer characteristics;

• Assessment of the possible connection to Chapman Creek; and

• The water quality results including a comparison to the Fresh Water Aquatic Water Quality Guidelines.

1.2.6 Task 8 – Groundwater Licensing Amendment

GW Solutions will assist the client in applying for an Amendment of Groundwater License at FrontCounter BC (BC Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development - FLNRORD).
2 PROPOSED FEES

Table 1 presents the cost for drilling two 6-inch test wells. The cost per well is estimated at $29,450. This scenario does not include pump testing.

Table 2 summarizes the cost for drilling and testing two 6-inch test wells. The cost per well is estimated at $45,950.

Finally, Table 3 summarizes the cost for drilling and testing two 12-inch production wells. The cost per each production well corresponds to approximately $96,150.

Expenses include a water level logger purchase/rental, rental fee of small equipment during field work (water level probe and multi-parameter probe), mobilization /demobilization (mileage, work trip hours, ferry fares), stay (accommodation and meals) and laboratories (water quality and sieve analysis).

Cost estimates from the drilling contractors is attached along with this proposal.

GW Solutions will invoice monthly for time actually spent on the project at applicable hourly rates. GW Solutions’ staff 2020 hourly discounted rates ranging from $120 to $180. The costs for administration will be charged at 9% of the engineering fees.
Table 1. Cost estimate for drilling two test wells (6-inch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total Task (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Kick-off meeting and preliminary site visit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Review the existing information to determine the location of the proposed test well(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Groundwater Exploration Program-Drilling Test Well(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,520</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td>$51,170</td>
<td>$51,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3a - Field planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3b - Supervision of drilling the test wells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$4,020</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3c - Sieve analysis and screen design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3d - Well completion and development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Reporting - short memo to describe the completed tasks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 - Updating scope of work for Phase 2 based on the result of GW Exploration Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 - Project management and communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$4,840</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td>$58,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$15,360</td>
<td>$4,840</td>
<td>$58,910</td>
<td>$58,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Cost estimate for drilling and testing two test wells (6-inch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>GW 180</th>
<th>Staff 120</th>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total Task (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Kick-off meeting and preliminary site visit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,220</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Review the existing information to determine the location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the proposed test well(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Groundwater Exploration Program-Drilling Test Well(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,520</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td>$51,170</td>
<td>$51,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3a - Field planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3b - Supervision of drilling the test wells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$4,020</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3c - Sieve analysis and screen design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3d - Well completion and development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Groundwater Exploration Program- Pumping test program and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,130</td>
<td>$3,225</td>
<td>$24,670</td>
<td>$33,025</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water quality assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4a - Pumping test planning</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4b - Installation / programming of level loggers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4c - Step test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>$24,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4d - Supervision of constant rate pumping test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4e - Installation and programming of multi-parameters probe,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection of water sample and water quality analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 - Reporting - short memo to describe the completed tasks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 - Updating scope of work for Phase 2 based on the result of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW Exploration Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7 - Project management and communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$20,490</td>
<td>$8,065</td>
<td>$63,380</td>
<td>$91,935</td>
<td>$91,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Cost estimate for drilling and testing two production wells (12-inch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total Task (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Well(s) specifications and location considering the existing regulations and limitations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Well drilling program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
<td></td>
<td>$145,040</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3a - Field planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3b - Supervision of drilling of production well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$4,020</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$131,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3c - Sieve analysis and screen design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>$131,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3d - Well completion and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Pumping test program and water quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,580</td>
<td>$3,225</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,655</td>
<td>$37,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4a - Pumping test planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4b - Installation / programming of level loggers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td></td>
<td>$755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4c - Step test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4d - Supervision of constant rate pumping test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,850</td>
<td>$2,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4e - Installation and programming of multi-parameters probe, collection of water sample and water quality analysis (Health Authority package)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5 - Data Interpretation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6 - Water Quality Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7 - Reporting on well drilling and testing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,120</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8 - Groundwater Licensing Application</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$720</td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9 - Project Management and communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$24,540</td>
<td>$7,165</td>
<td></td>
<td>$192,355</td>
<td><strong>$192,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GW Solutions is pleased to provide this proposal and looks forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Yours truly,

GW Solutions Inc.

Antonio Barroso, M.Sc, P.Eng.

Project Hydrogeologist-President
Chapman Creek Hatchery 12 inch production well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>qt</th>
<th>price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of crew and equipment (Based on 2 12” wells)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$22,720</td>
<td>$22,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 inch surface seal 5m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 inch drive shoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 inch drilled and cased</td>
<td>164ft</td>
<td>$185/ft</td>
<td>$30,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 inch telescopic 316 SS screen</td>
<td>$970/ft</td>
<td>10ft</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to install screen and develop well</td>
<td>20hr</td>
<td>$350/hr</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living out (2 man crew)</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 well total                                                  | $77,260 |
| 1 mobilization charge only                                    | $131,800 |

6 inch test well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>qt</th>
<th>price</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of crew and equipment per well (based on 2 wells)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living out allowance</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>$300/day</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface seal 8 inch</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 inch drilled and cased</td>
<td>165ft</td>
<td>$57/ft</td>
<td>$9,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 inch drilling open hole</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35/ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 inch drive shoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 inch telescopic SS well screen 4ft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional well screens 4ft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well cap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development time to set screens, bail and air lift well</td>
<td>5hr</td>
<td>$350/hr</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 well total                                                  | $22,955 |
| 2 wells total                                                 | $38,710 |
### 24 hr Pump test 12 inch well (200 gpm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>qt</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of crew and equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,920</td>
<td>$5,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump rental submersible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator rental</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set and pull pump and discharge</td>
<td>16hr</td>
<td>$185/hr</td>
<td>$2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step test</td>
<td>5hr</td>
<td>$185/hr</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump test with 3 hr recovery</td>
<td>27hr</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge 4 inch PVC</td>
<td>100ft</td>
<td>2.50/ft</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living out (2 man crew)</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 test total $19,285

1 mobilization and pump rental charge only

2 tests total $28,850

### 24 hr Pump test 6 inch well (100 gpm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>qt</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of crew and equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,820</td>
<td>$4,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump rental submersible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator rental</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set and pull pump and discharge</td>
<td>12hr</td>
<td>$185/hr</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step test</td>
<td>5hr</td>
<td>$185/hr</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump test with 3 hr recovery</td>
<td>27hr</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge 2 inch PVC</td>
<td>100ft</td>
<td>$1/ft</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living out (2 man crew)</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 test total $15,995

1 mobilization and pump rental charge only

2 tests total $24,670
Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing in support of the Chapman Creek Hatchery in their pursuit to establish a suitable water source that will maintain the hatchery for the future of our lakes, rivers, and oceans.

The Chapman Creek Hatchery, also known as the Sunshine Coast Salmonid Enhancement Society, have been our neighbor, sharing property lines with our club for many years. In the fall of 2019, the Hatchery was advised that the water source which sustains the fish pools was to be reduced and unfortunately the salmonids would not survive. This situation is disastrous.

The Sunshine Coast Rod & Gun Club, a nonprofit organization, wish to support the Hatchery in conducting test drills for suitable water sources on or near our property. The representative of the Hatchery, Simon Grant, has agreed that the Hatchery will investigate, provide and be responsible for all legal aspects for these test sites. The Hatchery will provide all the necessary documents and permits to our club prior to start of any drilling is conducted.

If there are any questions, you can contact us at info@scrgc.ca

Sincerely,

Patricia Dobson
Secretary
Sunshine Coast Rod & Gun Club
Protecting Coastal History Project
Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives
Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund
Application for Funding

Name of Project: Protecting Coastal History Project
Name of Organization: Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives
Contact Person: Matthew Lovegrove, Curator
Phone Number: 604-886-8232
Email: scma_manager@dccnet.com
Total Funds Requested: $12,600
Website: www.sunshinecoastmuseum.ca www.facebook.com/SunshineCoastMuseum

I. Needs Statement

Due to covid-19, the Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives is facing unprecedented challenges in retrofitting our premises to safeguard for our visitors and collections. This project is aimed at creating safer conditions onsite for our visitors while increasing our long-term preservation capacity to protect artifacts and archives. At the heart of the project is a retrofit of our current HVAC unit to create a safer environment for our visitors by increasing air circulation, while creating a better ambient environment (temperature, humidity) to preserve artifacts. Previously, Thomas Heating installed a basic HVAC unit in our upstairs gallery, but in the current configuration, it does not control humidity, or circulate sufficient air throughout the building. On a daily basis, Museum staff must check hygrometers and stand-alone dehumidifiers to ensure that the building is within our environmental targets. The urgency of our HVAC retrofit is now even more vital as it will allow for indoor/outdoor air circulation that encourages the removal of unwanted air particles that may contain covid-19.

We must also address covid-19 safety concerns for visitors and staff, including the creation of sanitation stations, stocking additional cleaning supplies/hand sanitizer, and offering the opportunity for visitors to obtain a free, Museum-branded textile mask for their visit. As a first point of contact for visitors coming into the community, we must take every precaution to encourage the health of our visitors, staff, and community. Since March, we have been voluntarily closed, resulting in a loss of substantial revenue; this opportunity will allow us to safeguard our facility to the best of our ability, protecting our visitors now, and our collections well into the future.
**Benefit to Community**

By creating a better environment for artifacts and archives to be preserved in the long-term, future generations will benefit from the continued opportunity to access items of historical relevance to the Sunshine Coast. One of the primary drivers of deterioration is environmental fluctuations; the installation of a dynamic HVAC system will create ideal conditions to ensure valuable artifacts and archives are preserved for our community’s benefit. Improved air circulation will also provide a safer visitor environment. As the museum is often the first point of contact for visitors coming to the Sunshine Coast, this safety precaution will lessen the possibility of our facility becoming a vector for the spread of covid-19. By protecting our visitors and staff, we are also protecting the Sunshine Coast community as a whole. During their visit, tourists will feel secure knowing that the Museum has implemented strict safety procedures to prevent transmission during the pandemic, as evidenced by sanitation stations, the availability of free textile masks, etc. In the long-term, the retrofitted HVAC system will also offer continued benefit by lessening the community spread of other airborne illnesses, such as the seasonal cold and flu.

**II. Project Description**

The primary goals of the Protecting Coastal History Project are to safeguard our community historical resources, while protecting the visitors and residents of the Sunshine Coast during the covid-19 pandemic. We will achieve this by retrofitting our HVAC unit to increase indoor/outdoor air circulation, a recommended approach in lessening covid-19 particles in enclosed spaces. This retrofit will also create better preservation conditions to protect artifacts that tell the story of the Sunshine Coast. Through the support of the Legacy Fund grant, we will also enhance our covid-19 response through added organizational infrastructure to safeguard for our visitors and community.

**Project Activities:**

1. Retrofit of HVAC unit to increase air circulation throughout the entire Museum (air exchange currently only occurs on the 2nd floor); Installation of one-touch environmental controls for temperature/humidity levels
2. Install temperature/humidity controls on both floors to better meet preservation needs
3. Purchase cleaning supplies from Dragon’s Den Janitorial (Sechelt) to ensure we can meet the proper cleaning procedures during subsequent covid-19 phases (anticipated 12-18 months)
4. Enhance current sanitation stations; Add more stations, including the installation of a standing outdoor sanitation station for our visitors to use before entering the building
5. Purchase of Museum-branded textile masks to be offered free of charge for their visit to the Museum and the Sunshine Coast
**Measurements of Success**

1. The creation of a safer environment at the Museum will translate into higher visitation rates and longer visit times for tourists. By safeguarding the visitor experience, we will be able to better meet our organizational mandate to educate our visitors on the history of the Sunshine Coast.

2. By implementing high-level covid-19 protocol and infrastructure, we will contribute to the protection of all Sunshine Coast residents by limiting the spread of covid-19 to the coast from off-coast visitors.

3. Increased capacity for preservation of Sunshine Coast history, including the fascinating histories of the Sechelt region. By installing one-touch environmental controls, we will be able to better protect our collections for the benefit of future generations. This will be measured by hygrometers throughout the Museum environment which will indicate the recommended environmental conditions.

**Long-Term Viability**

By working with the Sunshine Coast Community Forest on this project, we will ensure that our community history is safeguarded with a higher level of preservation while protecting our visitors and residents of the Sunshine Coast from the possible increased spread of covid-19. Both of these goals will lead to an increased organizational capacity, as well as increased trust in the Museum to serve our community, and we look forward to the possibility of partnering with the SCCF on this important project.

**III. Legacy Fund Criteria**

The Protecting Coastal History Project meets the Legacy Fund criteria in the following ways:

1. The Protecting Coastal History Project will be a community asset by upgrading the Museum’s capacity to welcome visitors in a safe manner while preserving our community historical assets for future generations. Increased safety measures will translate to longer visitor time in the Museum to explore Sunshine Coast history, including an extensive forestry exhibit that helps educate the public on past and present forestry practices on the Sunshine Coast. By learning about local history, including the logging heritage of the region, residents will be better equipped to understand the community, whether they are locals or visitors.

2. Our organization operates through the joint support of the Sunshine Coast Regional District, which includes the District of Sechelt and Area’s E & F. The Town of Gibsons offers continued, long-term support of our operations, while we have a strong track-record of working directly with the shíshálh and Skwxwú7mesh Nations on co-curated exhibits, programming, and outreach.
3. The Museum in Gibsons has a long history of representing the heritage of the entire Sunshine Coast, from Port Mellon to Egmont. The Sunshine Coast Museum & Archives is the result of the 2002 amalgamated Elphinstone Pioneer Museum and the Maritime Museum. The Elphinstone Pioneer Museum was founded in 1966, while the Maritime Museum was founded in 1989. When the amalgamation occurred, the Sunshine Coast Regional District began providing financial support to allow for the hiring of a professional staff to operate the Museum. The SCMA is a fiscally sustainable non-profit organization created for the benefit of all Sunshine Coast residents.

4. The Protecting Coastal History Project is slated to begin in early summer 2020. For all aspects of this project, we will hire local companies and tradespeople whenever this is possible. Thomas Heating will be the local contractor used for the HVAC retrofit, while Dragon’s Den janitorial will the supplier of cleaning/sanitation supplies. Staying true to the vision of supporting local tradesman and the Sunshine Coast economy, we are proud to hire local workers and contractors.

5. As the SCMA represents the history of the entire Sunshine Coast, we contain a strong representation of Sechelt history within our archives and on exhibit. Many of the logging artifacts on exhibit are from the era of hand-logging from the Sechelt area.

Tsawaysia and Dominique Spukwus at the Grand Opening of the Sunshine Coast Community Forest supported Universal Accessibility Project (2016)
Project Timeline

**Early July**: Hazardous Materials testing to ensure that no asbestos is disturbed in the HVAC venting

**July 10-15**: Research and order cleaning and sanitation supplies needed for the anticipated 12-18 month continuation of various stages of covid-19 lockdown

**July 15-30**: Engage CoastStructual in structural building analysis on the installation of HVAC venting from the 2nd floor to the main floor

**July 15-30**: Design/order outdoor sanitation station; Add additional stations within the museum to meet visitor needs

**July 20-July 31**: Design/order visitor masks

**August 1-15**: Prepare archives, upstairs exhibits for retrofit of HVAC unit; Move exhibits, archival cabinets as needed

**August 15-25**: Thomas Heating Retrofit HVAC unit

**September 15-October 15**: Project promotion period, including press release, photograph with SCCF directors, District of Sechelt directors at Museum, social media promotion
Protecting Coastal History Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Confirmed?</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunshine Coast Museum &amp; Archives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunshine Coast Community Forest Legacy Fund</td>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Materials/Supplies</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Material Testing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HVAC Upgrade – Thomas Heating</td>
<td>$8000</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleaning Supplies – Dragon’s Den</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitizer, Sanitation Stations - Dragon’s Den</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branded Masks (250 pieces)</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting - CoastStructural</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Estimated Project Costs</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acknowledgement of Financial Partners

Along with a community campaign of public acknowledgement of financial partners, the Museum will mount a plaque acknowledging the support of the Sunshine Coast Community Forest in helping to protect our visitors and our collection.

Authorized Signature: Matthew Lovegrove, Curator

Date: July 2nd, 2020

Thank you for your consideration of the Protecting Coastal History Project! We look forward to the possibility of working with you to preserve the history of the Sunshine Coast!
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: July 15, 2020

FROM: Manager of Financial Services

SUBJECT: Design and Build for the Operations Centre Proposals Results

FILE NO: 1200-20-2020

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from, Manager of Financial Services, regarding Design and Build for the Operations Centre Proposals Results be received.

2. That Council direct staff to proceed with the award of a contract to Caerus Construction Ltd. for the design and engineering of the Operations Centre as proposed for the total amount of $132,743.73, plus GST, to be funded from the Public Works Yard Reserve account.

3. That Council direct staff to proceed with a tender to complete the offsite construction for the road, sanitary, storm, water, streetlight, and landscaping to maximum budget of $680,000, plus GST, to be funded from the Public Works Yard Reserve account.

4. That Council direct staff to proceed with the notice of intent to award the contract with Caerus Construction Ltd. for a total base building costs amount of $2,365,750, plus GST, contingent on the approval of borrowing funds through the Electoral Alternative Approval Process.

5. That staff be authorized to undertake an Alternative Approval Process as authorized under s. 86 of the Community Charter, to facilitate borrowing of up to $2,771,244 to be repaid over a period not to exceed 25 (twenty-five) years in order to finance the costs of constructing the Operations Centre.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval to award the design and engineering contract work and provide a notice of intent to award the contract, for construction of the new Operations Centre to Ceaurus Construction Ltd. In addition, the report requests Council approval to tender the offsite work for the project and for staff to undertake the Alternative Approval Process for long-term borrowing for the project.

OPTIONS

1. Endorse the above recommendations.
2. Council could defer the decision and request further information.
DISCUSSION

Context/Background
On March 5, 2020, the District of Sechelt (the “District”) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the design and construction of the Operations Centre for the Public Works and Parks departments (“PW and Parks”). The site is located on Lot L, 5400 Dusty Road, Sechelt. The scope of work under this RFP included the provision of all necessary materials, labour, tools and equipment to design and construct an Operations Centre and supply and install all civil works for the proper function of the facility.

The District received a total of 11 proposals for the RFP. The evaluation of the proposals included three stages of review:

Stage 1 - A review of the mandatory criteria. Four proposals did not meet the mandatory requirements and did not move ahead to the second review stage.

Stage 2 - The evaluation of the proposals conducted by a team consisting of staff, Council and a consultant. The proposals were evaluated against pre-defined criteria, which included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corporate Demonstrated Experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resource Qualifications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approach, Methodology, and Work Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total for Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3 - Reference checks of the highest scoring Proponent to validate any part of the proposal.

As a result of the individual and the consultant evaluation reviews, the evaluation team recommends proceeding with the proposal received from Caerus Construction Ltd. (Caerus) and Attachment 1 includes some of the drawing and rendering images provided by Caerus.

The Caerus Construction Ltd. proposal includes the following positive features:

- Use of transom windows for natural light.
- Very compact plan.
- Outdoor patios adjacent to lunch and office space.
- Generous landscaping.
- Design could support “Wood First” grant.
- Bays oriented away from public view.
- Drive through public works bay
- Public bathroom access from reception
Staff recommend the following approvals from Council to move ahead with the project:

1. Award the contract to commence the engineering and design component of the project with funding from reserve.
2. Tender the offsite construction work, to be funded by reserve.
4. That staff be directed to undertake the Alternative Approval Process to seek the electoral approval to borrow funds for construction costs.

**Strategic Plan**

**Strategic Priority 7. Improving operations and infrastructure.**
The District is committed to improving the delivery and effectiveness of municipal services and infrastructure throughout the District to meet community needs and to respond to changing conditions. We will do this by:

7.5 Completing the construction of the Parks and Public Works Operation Building.

**Policy Implications**

**Council Policy 2.94 – Procurement**

- The District will procure all goods and services efficiently, fairly, and economically, in a publicly accountable, open, and transparent manner.
- Upon Council resolution to award a contract, the Mayor and Corporate Officer shall sign on behalf of Council for contracts greater than $250,000

**Financial Implications**

As a part of the 2020-2024 Capital Plan, funding was approved in the amount of $844,463 for the Operations Centre for the Public Works and Parks Departments. Staff recommend proceeding with the design, engineering, and offsite services with the current funding available in reserve and proceed with the Alternative Approval Process for approval of borrowing funds for the construction costs.

The budget to support the recommendations for the project and funding sources include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and Engineering</td>
<td>$132,744</td>
<td>Public Works Building Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Costs</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>Public Works Building Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contingency</td>
<td>$30,720</td>
<td>Public Works Building Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funded from Reserve</strong></td>
<td><strong>$843,464</strong></td>
<td>Public Works Building Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>$2,365,750</td>
<td>Long-term Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contingency</td>
<td>$405,494</td>
<td>Long-term Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Borrowed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,771,244</strong></td>
<td>Long-term Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,614,708</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The breakdown of the budgeted costs proposed by Caerus Construction Ltd. include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and Engineering</td>
<td>$132,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Costs</td>
<td>$20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$1,953,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Hydro Service</td>
<td>$29,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Landscaping &amp; Fencing</td>
<td>$54,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Civil Works</td>
<td>$307,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recommendation for Contract Award</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,498,494</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Construction (recommended for tender)</td>
<td>$589,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,088,018</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven qualified proposals received include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF PROPONENT SUBMITTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED RATE (pre-tax)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JDG Construction Management LMTD</td>
<td>$3,215,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CAERUS Construction Ltd.</td>
<td><strong>$3,088,018</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spani Developments</td>
<td>$2,470,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converge Construction, LTD.</td>
<td>$3,765,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seko Construction</td>
<td>$2,398,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traugott Building Contractors Inc.</td>
<td>$4,800,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales McLelland Construction</td>
<td>$4,727,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caerus Construction Ltd. included $589,524 of offsite construction costs, which have not been included with the recommended commitment of work to Caerus. The offsite construction costs are services to the property, which include road, sanitary, storm, water, streetlight, and landscaping. The road portion includes the option of paving the parking surrounding the proposed Operations Centre. Staff recommend issuing a tender for the offsite work.

Communications
Notice of the contract award is provided to each of the proponents and will be posted to the District’s website.

Respectfully submitted,

Ben Currie
Manager of Financial Services

Reviewed by: D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services  X
Reviewed by: J. Rogers, Communications Manager  X
Reviewed by: J. Frank, Corporate Officer  X
Approved by: A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer  X

Attachment 1 – Drawing and Rendering Package
FOR INFORMATION

TO: Council

FROM: Director of Financial Services

SUBJECT: 2020 Property Tax Statistics

FILE NO: 1970-01-2020

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT the report from the Director of Financial Services regarding 2020 property Tax Statistics be received for Information

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a summary of the 2020 property tax statistics. These statistics can be used to identify trends with home owner grants claimed, deferred tax participants, total taxes collected, and penalties applied. It is important to note that this report focuses on the total portion of property taxes due including the levies from other jurisdictions.

DISCUSSION
Context/Background

The District of Sechelt requisitioned approximately $27.5 million in property taxes, parcel taxes and user fees in 2020 from 6,345 properties. The District collected $22 million (80%) of the total taxes before the July 2 deadline.

Of the total property taxes collected, the District retains approximately $9.9 million to provide for Police Protection, Corporate Services, Sustainable Planning and Community Development, Administration, Facilities, Parks, Airport, Community Services, Public Works, and Bylaw Enforcement Services. These taxes are the ‘Municipal General Tax’ portion printed on the annual tax notice. Further, the District collects 1.05 million to fund solid waste and 3.02 million for sewer treatment and collection.

The District also collects $13.5 million and remits to the following taxing authorities:

- Provincial Government (School Taxes) - $5.39 million.
- Sunshine Coast Regional District - $6.2 million
- Regional Hospital District - $371,887
- Fire Protection District - $1.38 million.
- BC Assessment Authority - $177,421
- Municipal Finance Authority - $814
The municipality has no control over the taxation rates for these agencies. The municipality pays these taxes to each agency even if property owners do not pay their annual property taxes.

**Additional Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Properties by Class</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Forest Land</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Non-Profit</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>6,288</td>
<td>6,208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Penalties on Outstanding Current Taxes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Properties Posted Penalty</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>801</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Value of first 5% Penalty on July 3rd.</th>
<th>$97,184</th>
<th>$93,848</th>
<th>$80,542</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Important to note 2019 penalty includes the first 5% penalty posted for to residential taxes only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outstanding Taxes as of July 3, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>4,970,830</td>
<td>3,744,869</td>
<td>3,306,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>405,109</td>
<td>432,752</td>
<td>298,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>154,902</td>
<td>111,378</td>
<td>118,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,530,842</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,288,999</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,723,821</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Properties Eligible for the Home Owner Grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Single Family</td>
<td>4337</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>4245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Strata</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>5074</td>
<td>4959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Home Owner Grants Claimed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Grant ($770)</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (over 65 $1045)</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>2,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Veterans Allowance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional HOG-deceased claimants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,363</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,751</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of home owner grants claimed compared to eligible properties.

### Online HOG Claimed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Grant</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (over 65)</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Assistance for Persons with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Veterans Allowance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,636</strong></td>
<td><strong>940</strong></td>
<td><strong>870</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Online Home Owner Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.65%</td>
<td>25.01%</td>
<td>23.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Implications

By collecting 22 million dollars of property taxation, the District is in a very positive cash flow position. By August 1st, the District will have to submit the following payments totaling $6.75 Million:

- Sunshine Coast Regional District - $6.2 million
- Regional Hospital District - $371,887
- BC Assessment Authority - $177,421
- Municipal Finance Authority - $814

By the end of September, the District will need to pay the Fire Protection District - $1.38 million and in December we will be required to pay Provincial Government (School Taxes). At this point, I don’t expect that the District will need to borrow funds allowed under the District’s Revenue Anticipation Borrowing Bylaw.

Strategic Plan

Strategic Priority 2, enhancing fiscal sustainability. The District focuses on fiscal sustainability of the municipality to ensure the provision of needed services and infrastructure.

Communications

The 2020 Property Tax Statistics will be made available on the District’s website.

Respectfully submitted,

David Douglas
Director of Financial Services
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor & Council

FROM: Director of Financial Services

SUBJECT: Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program

FILE NO: 1855

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT the report from the Director of Financial Services regarding Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program, be received.

2. THAT Council increase the 2020 capital projects to include the out-door performance stage at Hackett Park in the amount of $253,000, and that the Funding be 185,525 from the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program grant and $67,475 be funded from the Capital Reserve.

PURPOSE
To update Council on a grant award and to bring forward a motion to fund the project in 2020.

OPTIONS

1. That Council directs staff to continue to budget the project for 2021.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background
In January 2019, the District of Sechelt applied for a grant from the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program to build a multi-use outdoor performance space in Hackett Park. The total project was estimated to cost $253,000, the grant portion being $185,524 and the District identified $67,476 as matching funds.

At the time of the 2020 budget the District had not heard from the granting organization as to the success of our application and staff deferred the capital item to 2021. On July 3, 2020, the District was awarded the grant and staff suggest that now is a good time to complete the project as there are few events moving forward this year, rather than to delay until 2021. The funding agreement allows the District to spend the funds from May 11, 2020 to March 31, 2025.
Strategic Plan

Moving this project to 2020 will promote Goal #1: Economic Prosperity; Goal #3: Enhance Community Liveability and Goal #5: Revitalization of the Downtown.

Policy Implications
None

Financial Implications

Thirty three point thirty three percent (33.33%) of the approved project costs will be funded by the Province, forty percent (40%) of the approved project funds will be provided by Canada, and the remaining twenty seven percent (27%) by the District of Sechelt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>$ 84,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$ 101,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>$ 67,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 253,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently the Capital Reserve has an estimated $374,641 available for capital projects, reducing this amount by $67,475 will leave approximately $307,166 remaining for future capital works.

Respectfully submitted,

David M. Douglas
Director of Financial Services

Reviewed by: D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services  X
Reviewed by: J. Rogers, Communications Manager  X
Reviewed by: J. Frank, Corporate Officer  X
Approved by: A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer  X
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Corporate Officer
SUBJECT: Update: Sechelt Downtown Business Association ICET Application – Downtown Sechelt ‘On-Street Patio’ Program

FILE NO: 0230

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from the Corporate Officer regarding Sechelt Downtown Business Association ICET application update, be received.

2. That Council confirm its previous resolution to provide $4000 in matching funds or pass a resolution confirming a different amount.

3. That the appropriate Licence to Occupy Agreement be entered into with the Sechelt Downtown Business Association to authorize the placement of on-street patios on District rights-of-way on Cowrie Street as delineated in the Licence Agreement. Further, that the Mayor and Corporate Officer be authorized to sign the Agreement.

PURPOSE

To provide Council with an update on the Sechelt Downtown Business Association (SDBA)’s application to Island Coastal Economic Trust (ICET) for a grant towards installation of on-street patios; and to confirm Council’s direction regarding authorization for Sechelt matching funds.

OPTIONS

1. Staff are seeking direction from Council on options for providing matching funds.
2. Should the project proceed, it would be in order for Council to approve executing a Licence to Occupy Agreement.
3. Council could defer consideration of this item pending some other action.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background

At its June 24, 2020 Special meeting, Council considered the SDBA’s application for an ICET grant for installation of two street patios. The proposal was for a $6000 ICET grant, with the SDBA contributing $2000 and the District contributing matching funds of $4000. Council endorsed SDBA’s application and directed that the $4000 grant be approved and allocated from the Council Contingency operating account.
ICET considered the SDBA’s application and approved a grant of $3500, rather than the full $6000. Since the $4000 grant from the Council Contingency account will be more than “matching funds”, it would be appropriate for Council to confirm whether it wishes to proceed with giving the full amount or decrease it. The SDBA confirms that they will still contribute the $2000.

The attached draft Licence to Occupy Agreement that the SDBA and District will enter into is attached for Council’s reference. The Licence includes a “Schedule A” that sets out guidelines to be followed. The SDBA and staff are finalizing some of those details. Once Council approves the Agreement, it will be finalized and sent out for signatures.

Appendix 1 to the Licence Agreement shows the approximate locations of each patio and their dimensions. They will each be: 5.4 metres in length; 2.4 metres in width, and an area of 12.96 metres. One will be placed in front of “The Dock” business strip and the other south west of the rainbow crosswalk.

**Strategic Plan**
- Goal #1 – Promoting economic prosperity;
- Goal #5 – Revitalizing the downtown;
- Goal #6 – Improving governance and communication.

**Policy Implications**
District of Sechelt Highway and Parking Bylaw No. 516, 2012 requires that a Licence to Occupy Agreement be executed prior to encroachment on District streets or sidewalks.

**Financial Implications**
As previously reported to Council, the Council Contingency account has a budget of $10,000 for 2020 and there have been no expenditures from the account to date. The Council Contingency budget provides funding for one-time expenditures or initiatives that may arise in the year that were not known or expected at the time the operating budget was approved by Council.

**Communications**
Staff will inform the SDBA of Council’s decision and work with the Association to finalize details.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo-Anne Frank
Corporate Officer

Attachments:
1. Letter from ICET confirming grant
2. Draft Licence to Occupy Agreement

| Reviewed by: | D. Douglas, Director of Financial Services | X |
| Reviewed by: | J. Rogers, Communications Manager | X |
| Approved by: | A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer | X |
June 30, 2020

Theressa Logan, Executive Director
Sechelt Downtown Business Association
PO Box 442
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

Dear Ms. Logan,

**Re: Sechelt On Street Patio Program**

We are pleased to advise you that your funding application to the Small Capital Restart Funding Program has been approved for $3,500, to be allocated towards activities associated with the Sechelt On Street Patio Program.

This approval is open for a period of 30 days from the date of this letter, within which we expect a funding agreement to be executed with Island Coastal Economic Trust and the project commenced. It is important to note that expenditures incurred prior to the signing of the contribution agreement will not be reimbursed.

In the attached funding agreement, there are several conditions and requirements associated with the approved funding. Please read these over carefully. If the agreement is satisfactory, please have it signed and dated by an authorized signing officer and email it to denice.regnier@islandcoastaltrust.ca.

Upon entering into a funding agreement, ICET staff commit to respond quickly to your questions, to process payments, and to support your project through to completion.

We wish you every success in your project and thank you for your commitment to support immediate, short-term COVID related business and industry restart. Should you require additional information or clarification, please contact Denice Regnier, Manager Programs and Corporate Affairs at 250-871-7797 or denice.regnier@islandcoastaltrust.ca.

Sincerely yours,

Line Robert
Chief Executive Officer

Digitally signed by Line Robert
Date: 2020.07.02 09:52:05 -07'00'
Licence to Occupy - Sechelt Street Patios

This Licence to Occupy Agreement is dated the _____ day of ______________________ 2020.

BETWEEN:

DISTRICT OF SECHELT,
2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie Street, PO Box 129
Sechelt, British Columbia  V0N 3A0

(the “District”)

AND:

SECHELT DOWNTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION,
#203 – 5760 Teredo Street, PO Box 442
Sechelt, British Columbia  V0N 3A0

(the “Licencee”)

Purpose:

This Licence to Occupy is to define the terms and conditions under which the Licencee may expand onto District of Sechelt owned rights-of-way on Cowrie Street for the purpose of outdoor dining.

Definitions:

In this License Agreement:

(a) “Licence Area” means the License Area described in Appendix 1 attached to and forming part of this Licence Agreement;

(b) “Licence Purposes” means the purposes described in Section 1.2;

(c) “Street furnishings” means a temporary patio structure and all furnishings and related apparatus placed thereon for the purpose of outdoor dining.

WHEREAS:

A. The District of Sechelt Council wishes to provide the opportunity for the placement of temporary, outdoor patios on District rights-of-way.

B. The Licencee has requested permission from the District to encroach upon, occupy and use a portion or portions of a Highway on Cowrie Street in the District of Sechelt for the purpose of installing prefabricated, removable, wooden patios and all related equipment and apparatus, to accommodate outdoor dining.
C. The District has agreed to grant the Licencee’s request on the terms and conditions of this Licence Agreement and subject to compliance with the District’s bylaws.

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of matters referred to in the foregoing recitals, the covenants and agreements herein contained and other good and valuable consideration (the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged and agreed to by the parties), the parties hereby covenant and agree as follows:

1. Grant of Licence - The District hereby grants to the Licencee permission to use, encroach upon and occupy the areas shown in Appendix 1 attached to this Licence Agreement. All use must comply with District of Sechelt Bylaws and any applicable statutes or regulations of the Provincial or Federal Government. Each patio shall not exceed an area of 12.96 metres.

2. Licence Purpose - This License is granted for the exclusive purpose of the placement of two (2) prefabricated, removable, wooden patios to accommodate outdoor dining.

3. Term - This Agreement shall be for a term commencing on the date first written above and terminating on October 31, 2020 unless terminated sooner pursuant to the terms of this Licence Agreement.

4. Street Furnishings – The Licencee may construct, or deposit on and within the Licence Area, in accordance with the specifications and guidelines set out in Appendix 1 of this agreement, those works, fixtures, improvements, furniture, equipment, chattels, personal property and materials as approved by the District. The Licencee shall not construct, install or deposit any other Street Furnishings on or within the Licence Area, or make any structural repairs to the Street Furnishings, without the prior written approval of the District.

5. Placement – Street Furnishings shall not restrict movement of pedestrians on the sidewalk or Interfere with sightlines to neighbouring businesses. A sidewalk width of 1.5 metres shall be maintained at all times.

6. Repair and Maintenance - The Licencee shall at all times keep and maintain the Licence Area and Street Furnishings in good and sufficient repair to the satisfaction of the District. Should the Licencee fail to do so, the District may, at its sole discretion, cause such repairs to be made on the Licencee’s behalf and the Licencee shall be invoiced for any costs related to the repairs.
7. **Grant of Indemnity** - The Licencee hereby:

   (a) releases and discharges the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants and agents, and covenants and agrees to indemnify and save harmless the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants and agents, from and against all damages, losses, actions, causes of action, claims, demands, builders’ liens, liabilities, expenses, indirect or consequential damages, costs and expenses of any nature or kind whatsoever, whether at law or in equity, which may arise or accrue to the Licencee or any person, firm or corporation against the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants and agents or which the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants and agents may pay, incur, sustain or be put to:

   1. that arise out of, or are in any way connected to, or would not have been incurred but for:
      
      (A) the granting of the Licence;
      
      (B) the existence of the Street Furnishings
      
      (C) this Licence Agreement;
      
      D. the use and occupation of the Licence Area; or
      
      E. the design, construction and installation (including any defective materials or faulty workmanship) of the Street Furnishings; and

   (b) covenants and agrees to indemnify and save harmless the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants and agents, from and against all damages, losses, actions, causes of action, claims, demands, builders’ liens, liabilities, indirect or consequential damages, costs and expenses of any nature or kind whatsoever, whether at law or in equity which may arise or accrue to any person, firm or corporation against the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants or agents or which the District, its officials, officers, employees, servants or agents may pay, incur, sustain or be put to, by reason of:

   1. any negligent act or omission or wilful misconduct of the Licencee or any of its contractors, subcontractors, employees, agents, licensees, invitees and permittees in connection with the observance and performance of the obligations of the Licencee under this Licence Agreement;

   2. any default in the due observance and performance of the obligations and responsibilities of the Licencee under this Licence;  

8. **Insurance** - The Licencee shall maintain no less than $2,000,000 CDN general liability insurance coverage, per occurrence, all inclusive, for the duration of this Licence Agreement and shall name the District of Sechelt as an additional insured. The insurance policy shall not be cancelled, lapsed or materially changed without thirty (30) days written notice to the District;

9. **Termination for Default** - If the Licencee fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Licence Agreement and such non-compliance is not remedied to the satisfaction of the District within
five (5) business days after written notice to the Licencee by the District, the District may, on further written notice to the Licencee, forthwith terminate and revoke this Licence Agreement and the Licencee shall forthwith vacate the Licence Area, remove the Street Furnishings and restore the Licence Area to its original state, all at the cost of the Licencee and to the satisfaction of the District.

10. **Sale or Alienation of Land** - The Licencee shall not transfer or assign this Licence Agreement in whole or in part, and shall not permit or suffer any other person to occupy the Licence Area, in whole or in part, without the prior written consent of the District.

11. **Entire Agreement** - The provisions herein contained constitute the entire agreement between the parties and supersede all previous communications, representations and agreements, whether verbal or written between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof.

12. **Time of Essence** - Time is of the essence of this Agreement.

13. **Notice** - Any notice, approval or request required or permitted to be given under this License Agreement shall be in writing and may be given by delivery of such notice, approval or request to a representative of each party respectively at the addresses first above written. Any such notice, approval or request shall be deemed to have been received on the date of delivery of such notice, approval or request or, on the third business day following the date of such mailing if mailed through Canada Post.

The parties have executed this Agreement as of the date first written above.

Signed by the Authorized Signator(ies) of
SECHELT DOWNTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION by:                                                    )

____________________________________________________________________________________
Authorized Signatory                                                                      )

____________________________________________________________________________________
Authorized Signatory                                                                      )

Signed by the Authorized Signatories of the
DISTRICT OF SECHELT:                                                                       )

____________________________________________________________________________________
Mayor                                                                                        )

____________________________________________________________________________________
Corporate Officer                                                                      )

Witness Signature

Witness (Print Name)

Witness Address
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Director of Financial Services  
SUBJECT: BC Infrastructure Planning Grant  
FILE NO: 1855

MEETING DATE: July 15, 2020

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from the Director of Financial Services regarding the BC Infrastructure Planning Grant be received.

2. That Council approve a grant application being submitted to the BC Infrastructure Planning Grant Program to request funding to plan for the disposal of biosolids and solids from the District’s sewer operations, in the amount of $10,000, and $5,000 in matching funds be allocated from sewer operations.

PURPOSE
To receive Council approval to apply for a grant to fund a disposal of biosolids and solids plan.

OPTIONS

1. Council direct staff not to apply for a grant application for the disposal of biosolids and solids from sewer operations.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background
In the 2020 sewer budget staff included $20,000 for the investigation of disposal of biosolids and solids from the Dusty Road treatment facility. Currently there is an opportunity to apply for a further $10,000 in grant funding from the Infrastructure Planning Grant Program (IPGP). The IPGP program is focused on sustainability principles, which in the case of septage and biosolids is to find beneficial end uses of the product. IPGP also specifically encourages studying "innovation and new approaches”. In effect, the study becomes that of doing a Septage Solids Management Plan, and this then contributes to one of the requirements of a Liquid Waste Management Plan.

Strategic Plan
The long-term planning for the disposal of solids and biosolids would fall under Improving Operations and Infrastructure by improving the delivery and effectiveness of municipal services.
Policy Implications
None

Financial Implications
In applying for a $10,000 grant the District of Sechelt will be able to further study the opportunities for the disposal of biosolids and solids for the short term and long term. The District will be required to provide $5,000 of matching funds, which will be provided as part of the $20,000 included in the 2020 sewer budget for investigating the disposal of solids.

Communications
If the grant is approved the project will be advertised for qualified consultants to bid on the work and will follow the Districts purchasing policy.

Respectfully submitted,

David Douglas
Director of Financial Services

Reviewed by: J. Rogers, Communications Manager X
Reviewed by: J. Frank, Corporate Officer X
Approved by: A. Yeates, Chief Administrative Officer X
REQUEST FOR DECISION

TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Corporate Officer
SUBJECT: Open Meeting without Public Present Resolution
FILE NO: 2640-00

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the report from the Corporate Officer regarding Open Meeting without Public Present Resolution, be received.

2. WHEREAS Ministerial Order 192, issued June 17, 2020, requires that local governments make ‘best efforts’ to meet the legislative requirements to hold open meetings that enable the public to participate in-person;

   AND WHEREAS if a local government is not able to accommodate having the public attend in person at an open meeting because they are unable to meet the Public Health Officers recommendations regarding physical distancing and gathering requirements, the local government must pass a resolution providing a rationale for the continued need to meet without the public physically present;

   AND WHEREAS the District is currently exploring options for holding Council meetings in a way that will enable Council, staff and the public to safely attend;

   AND WHEREAS the District has been utilizing the ZOOM Webinar program to hold all District Council meetings, which has enabled Council, staff and the public to attend and participate as required;

   AND WHEREAS the electronic meeting format has been positively received by the public and has successfully resulted in an opportunity for the public to attend and participate through the regular question period format, delegations to Council, and overall public input format that resembles the standard in-person meeting. Council meetings are also live-streamed on the District’s YouTube channel;

   THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT given the District has not yet finalized arrangements to accommodate the public attending in person at Council meetings, the July 15, 2020 Regular Council meeting be held via electronic means.

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to present information respecting Ministerial Order No. 192, issued June 17, 2020, and the requirement to pass a resolution providing a rationale to meet without the public present.
OPTIONS

1. Amend the recommendation regarding holding the July 15, 2020 meeting without the public present before adopting it.

DISCUSSION

Context/Background

In response to the Province’s Restart Plan and as a means of encouraging local government to move back to normal operations to the best of their ability, the attached Ministerial Order No. 192 (M192) was issued on June 17, 2020. The Order removes authorization under a previous Ministerial Order (M83) for a local government to give readings and adopt bylaws (other than certain financial bylaws) at one meeting.

It also requires that local government make ‘best efforts’ to allow the public to physically attend open meetings while still ensuring COVID-19 Health Orders and recommendations are being adhered to. M192 also establishes that if a local government is not able to accommodate the attendance of the public in-person, a resolution must be passed stating the reason for holding meetings without the public and noting how openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability are being met.

As a means of understanding what ‘best efforts’ might look like, the Province issued Guidelines. The Guidelines set out that ‘best efforts’ to hold open meetings with public in attendance include providing information on how the local government will meet the Public Health Order requirements and recommendations by considering:

- How many members of the public can be safety accommodated while maintaining physical distancing (utilizing the 5 m² space/person rule and 2 meter physical distancing rule);
- Options for another meeting space;
- Management of public attendance if space is limited;
- Offering other ways, the public can provide input on agenda topics (ie: email, online submissions, letters);
- Options for electronic attendance by the public;
- Adjusting agenda items and meeting schedules of important or controversial issues to a larger meeting space;
- Providing access to draft agendas/minutes and old video recordings (if available);
- Providing information about what efforts have been made if a local government must continue to meet without the public physically present.

As the District is successfully utilizing the ZOOM webinar format for meetings and live streaming them on the District’s YouTube channel, the District is effectively ensuring that the public can not only hear, but hear and watch the proceedings, and able to participate during the open question period or public input portions of a meeting as may be required. As such, the District meets or exceeds ensuring that openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability are still being met while using an electronic meeting format.
Staff are finalizing details for establishing physical distancing and IT requirements for holding Council meetings in the Community Use Room or other location with the public in attendance. We anticipate having this completed in time for the August 5, 2020 Regular Council meeting.

**Strategic Plan**
Goal #6 – Improving governance and communication

**Policy Implications**
Ministerial Order No. 192 requires that Council pass a resolution if members of the public do not have the opportunity to attend Council meetings in person.

**Financial Implications**
None

**Communications**
The public will be notified when meeting facilities have been arranged so that the public can safely attend Council meetings. The agenda distributed for those meetings will also confirm this.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo-Anne Frank
Corporate Officer

Attachments:
1 – Ministerial Order No. M192
WHEREAS a declaration of a state of emergency throughout the whole of the Province of British Columbia was declared on March 18, 2020;

AND WHEREAS local governments, including the City of Vancouver, and related bodies must be able to conduct their business in accordance with public health advisories to reduce the threat of COVID-19 to the health and safety of members and employees of local government and related bodies and members of the public;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that public participation in local governance is an essential part of a free and democratic society and is important to local governments’ purpose of providing good government to communities;

AND WHEREAS the threat of COVID-19 to the health and safety of people has resulted in the requirement that local governments and related bodies implement necessary limitations on this public participation;

AND WHEREAS section 10 (1) of the Emergency Program Act provides that I may do all acts and implement all procedures that I consider necessary to prevent, respond to or alleviate the effects of any emergency or disaster;

I, Mike Farnworth, Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General, order that

(a) the Local Government Meetings and Bylaw Process (COVID-19) Order No. 2 made by MO 139/2020 is repealed, and

(b) the attached Local Government Meetings and Bylaw Process (COVID-19) Order No. 3 is made.

Date

17/06/2020

Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General

Authority under which Order is made:

Act and section: Emergency Program Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 111, s. 10

Other: MO 73/2020; MO 139/2020; OIC 310/2020
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT MEETINGS AND BYLAW PROCESS
(COVID-19) ORDER NO. 3

Division 1 – General

Definitions
1 In this order:
   “board” has the same meaning as in the Schedule of the Local Government Act;
   “council” has the same meaning as in the Schedule of the Community Charter;
   “improvement district” has the same meaning as in the Schedule of the Local Government Act;
   “local trust committee” has the same meaning as in section 1 of the Islands Trust Act;
   “municipality” has the same meaning as in the Schedule of the Community Charter;
   “municipality procedure bylaw” has the same meaning as “procedure bylaw” in the Schedule of the Community Charter;
   “regional district” has the same meaning as in the Schedule of the Local Government Act;
   “regional district procedure bylaw” means a procedure bylaw under section 225 of the Local Government Act;
   “trust body” means (a) the trust council, (b) the executive committee, (c) a local trust committee, or (d) the Islands Trust Conservancy, as defined in the Islands Trust Act;
   “Vancouver council” has the same meaning as “Council” in section 2 of the Vancouver Charter;

Application
2 (1) This order only applies during the period that the declaration of a state of emergency made March 18, 2020 under section 9 (1) of the Emergency Program Act and any extension of the duration of that declaration is in effect.

   (2) This order replaces the Local Government Meetings and Bylaw Process (COVID-19) Order No. 2 made by MO 139/2020.
Division 2 – Open Meetings

Open meetings – municipalities

3  (1) A council, or a body referred to in section 93 [application of rule to other bodies] of the Community Charter, must use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend an open meeting of the council or body in a manner that is consistent with any applicable requirements or recommendations made under the Public Health Act.

(2) A council or body is not required to allow members of the public to attend a meeting if, despite the best efforts of the council or body, the attendance of members of the public cannot be accommodated at a meeting that would otherwise be held in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the Public Health Act.

(3) If a council or body does not allow members of the public to attend a meeting, as contemplated in subsection (2) of this section,

(a) the council or body must state the following, by resolution:

(i) the basis for holding the meeting without members of the public in attendance;

(ii) the means by which the council or body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting, and

(b) for the purposes of Division 3 [Open Meetings] of Part 4 [Public Participation and Council Accountability] of the Community Charter, the meeting is not to be considered closed to the public.

(4) The council or body may pass a resolution under subsection (3) (a) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(5) This section applies despite

(a) Division 3 [Open Meetings] of Part 4 [Public Participation and Council Accountability] of the Community Charter, and

(b) any applicable requirements in a municipality procedure bylaw of a council.

Open meetings – regional districts

4  (1) A board, a board committee established under section 218 [appointment of select and standing committees] of the Local Government Act, or a body referred to in section 93 [application of rule to other bodies] of the Community Charter as that section applies under section 226 [board proceedings: application of Community Charter] of the Local Government Act, must use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend an open meeting of the board, board committee or body in a manner that is consistent with any applicable requirements or recommendations made under the Public Health Act.

(2) A board, board committee or body is not required to allow members of the public to attend a meeting if, despite the best efforts of the board, board committee or body, the attendance of members of the public cannot be accommodated at a meeting that would otherwise be held in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the Public Health Act.
(3) If a board, board committee or body does not allow members of the public to attend a meeting, as contemplated in subsection (2) of this section,
   
   (a) the board, board committee or body must state the following, by resolution:
       
       (i) the basis for holding the meeting without members of the public in attendance;
       
       (ii) the means by which the board, board committee or body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting, and
   
   (b) for the purposes of Division 3 [Open Meetings] of Part 4 [Public Participation and Council Accountability] of the Community Charter as that Division applies to a regional district under section 226 of the Local Government Act, the meeting is not to be considered closed to the public.

(4) The board, board committee or body may pass a resolution under subsection (3) (a) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(5) This section applies despite
   
   (a) Division 3 [Open Meetings] of Part 4 [Public Participation and Council Accountability] of the Community Charter,
   
   (b) section 226 [board proceedings: application of Community Charter] of the Local Government Act, and
   
   (c) any applicable requirements in a regional district procedure bylaw of a board.

Open meetings – Vancouver

5 (1) The Vancouver council, or a body referred to in section 165.7 [application to other city bodies] of the Vancouver Charter, must use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend an open meeting of the Vancouver council or the body in a manner that is consistent with any applicable requirements or recommendations made under the Public Health Act.

(2) The Vancouver council or a body is not required to allow members of the public to attend a meeting if, despite the best efforts of the Vancouver council or the body, the attendance of members of the public cannot be accommodated at a meeting that would otherwise be held in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the Public Health Act.

(3) If the Vancouver council or a body does not allow members of the public to attend a meeting, as contemplated in subsection (2) of this section,

   (a) the Vancouver council or the body must state the following, by resolution:
       
       (i) the basis for holding the meeting without members of the public in attendance;
       
       (ii) the means by which the Vancouver council or the body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting, and

   (b) for the purposes of section 165.1 [general rule that meetings must be open to the public] of the Vancouver Charter, the meeting is not to be considered closed to the public.
(4) The Vancouver council or a body may pass a resolution under subsection (3) (a) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(5) This section applies despite
   (a) section 165.1 of the Vancouver Charter, and
   (b) any applicable provision in the Vancouver procedure bylaw.

Open meetings – trust bodies

6 (1) A trust body, or a board of variance established by a local trust committee under section 29 (1) [land use and subdivision regulation] of the Islands Trust Act, must use best efforts to allow members of the public to attend an open meeting of the trust body or board of variance in a manner that is consistent with any applicable requirements or recommendations made under the Public Health Act.

(2) A trust body or board of variance is not required to allow members of the public to attend a meeting if, despite the best efforts of the trust body or board of variance, the attendance of members of the public cannot be accommodated at a meeting that would otherwise be held in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the Public Health Act.

(3) If a trust body or board of variance does not allow members of the public to attend a meeting, as contemplated in subsection (2) of this section,
   (a) the trust body or board of variance must state the following, by resolution:
      (i) the basis for holding the meeting without members of the public in attendance;
      (ii) the means by which the trust body or board of variance is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting, and
   (b) For the purposes of section 11 [procedures to be followed by local trust committees] of the Islands Trust Act, the meeting is not to be considered closed to the public.

(4) A trust body or board of variance may pass a resolution under subsection (3) (a) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(5) This section applies despite
   (a) section 11 [application of Community Charter and Local Government Act to trust bodies] of the Islands Trust Regulation, B.C. Reg. 119/90, and
   (b) any applicable requirements in a procedure bylaw of a trust body.

Division 3 – Electronic Meetings

Electronic meetings – municipalities

7 (1) A council, or a body referred to in section 93 [application of rule to other bodies] of the Community Charter, may conduct all or part of a meeting of the council or body by means of electronic or other communication facilities.
(2) A member of a council or body who participates in a meeting by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section is deemed to be present at the meeting.

(3) When conducting a meeting under subsection (1), a council or body must use best efforts to use electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public.

(4) If a council or body does not use electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3), the council or body must state the following, by resolution:
   (a) the basis for not using electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public;
   (b) the means by which the council or body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting.

(5) A council or body may pass a resolution under subsection (4) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(6) Section 128 (2) (c) and (d) [electronic meetings and participation by members] of the Community Charter does not apply in respect of a meeting conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section unless a council or body proceeds as described in subsection (3) of this section, in which case those paragraphs apply.

(7) This section applies despite
   (a) section 128 of the Community Charter, and
   (b) any applicable requirements in a municipality procedure bylaw of a council.

Electronic meetings – regional districts

8  (1) A board, a board committee established under section 218 [appointment of select and standing committees] of the Local Government Act, or a body referred to in section 93 [application of rule to other bodies] of the Community Charter as that section applies under section 226 [board proceedings: application of Community Charter] of the Local Government Act, may conduct all or part of a meeting of the board, board committee or body by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) A member of a board, board committee or body who participates in a meeting by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section is deemed to be present at the meeting.

(3) When conducting a meeting under subsection (1), a board, board committee or body must use best efforts to use electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public.

(4) If a board, board committee or body does not use electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3), the board, board committee or body must state the following, by resolution:
(a) the basis for not using electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public;

(b) the means by which the board, board committee or body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting.

(5) A board, board committee or body may pass a resolution under subsection (4) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(6) Section 2 (2) (d) and (e) [electronic meetings authorized] of the Regional District Electronic Meetings Regulation, B.C. Reg. 271/2005, does not apply in respect of a meeting conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section unless a board, board committee or body proceeds by using electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3) of this section, in which case those paragraphs apply.

(7) This section applies despite

(a) section 221 [electronic meetings and participation by members] of the Local Government Act,

(b) the Regional District Electronic Meetings Regulation, and

(c) any applicable requirements in a regional district procedure bylaw of a board.

Electronic meetings – Vancouver

9

(1) The Vancouver council, or a body referred to in section 165.7 [application to other city bodies] of the Vancouver Charter, may conduct all or part of a meeting of the Vancouver council or the body by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) A member of the Vancouver council or of a body who participates in a meeting by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section is deemed to be present at the meeting.

(3) When conducting a meeting under subsection (1), the Vancouver council or a body must use best efforts to use electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public.

(4) If the Vancouver council or a body does not use electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3), the Vancouver council or the body must state the following, by resolution:

(a) the basis for not using electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public;

(b) the means by which the Vancouver council or the body is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting.

(5) The Vancouver council or a body may pass a resolution under subsection (4) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.
(6) Section 2 (2) (c) and (d) [electronic meetings authorized] of the City of Vancouver Council Electronic Meetings Regulation, B.C. Reg. 42/2012, does not apply in respect of a meeting conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section unless the Vancouver council or a body proceeds by using electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3) of this section, in which case those paragraphs apply.

(7) This section applies despite
(a) section 164.1 [meeting procedures] of the Vancouver Charter,
(b) the City of Vancouver Council Electronic Meetings Regulation, and
(c) any applicable provision in the Vancouver procedure bylaw.

Electronic meetings – improvement districts

10 (1) An improvement district board, or a committee of an improvement district board appointed or established under section 689 [appointment of select and standing committees] of the Local Government Act, may conduct all or part of a meeting of the improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board, other than an annual general meeting, by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) A member of an improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board who participates in a meeting by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section is deemed to be present at the meeting.

(3) When conducting a meeting under subsection (1), an improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board must use best efforts to use electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public.

(4) If an improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board does not use electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3), the improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board must state the following, by resolution:

(a) the basis for not using electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public;

(b) the means by which the improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting.

(5) An improvement district board or committee of an improvement district board may pass a resolution under subsection (4) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(6) This section applies despite
(a) section 686 [meeting procedure – improvement district board] of the Local Government Act, and
(b) any applicable requirements in a procedure bylaw of an improvement district board.
Electronic meetings – trust bodies

11 (1) A trust body, or a board of variance established by a local trust committee under section 29 (1) [land use and subdivision regulation] of the Islands Trust Act, may conduct all or part of a meeting of the trust body or board of variance by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) A member of a trust body or board of variance who participates in a meeting by means of electronic or other communication facilities under this section is deemed to be present at the meeting.

(3) When conducting a meeting under subsection (1), a trust body or board of variance must use best efforts to use electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public.

(4) If a trust body or board of variance does not use electronic or other communication facilities as described in subsection (3), the trust body or board of variance must state the following, by resolution:
   (a) the basis for not using electronic or other communication facilities that allow members of the public to hear, or watch and hear, the part of the meeting that is open to the public;
   (b) the means by which the trust body or board of variance is ensuring openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability in respect of the meeting.

(5) A trust body or board of variance may pass a resolution under subsection (4) in reference to a specific meeting or, if the same circumstances apply, more than one meeting.

(6) This section applies despite
   (a) section 2 [electronic meetings authorized] of the Islands Trust Electronic Meetings Regulation, B.C. Reg. 283/2009, and
   (b) any applicable requirements in a procedure bylaw of a trust body or applicable to a board of variance.

Division 4 – Timing Requirements

Timing requirement for bylaw passage – municipalities

12 Despite section 135 (3) [requirements for passing bylaws] of the Community Charter, a council may adopt a bylaw on the same day that a bylaw has been given third reading if the bylaw is made in relation to
   (a) the following sections of the Community Charter:
      (i) section 165 [financial plan];
      (ii) section 177 [revenue anticipation borrowing];
      (iii) section 194 [municipal fees];
      (iv) section 197 [annual property tax bylaw];
      (v) section 200 [parcel tax bylaw];
      (vi) section 202 [parcel tax roll for purpose of imposing tax];
      (vii) section 224 [general authority for permissive exemptions];
(viii) section 226 [revitalization tax exemptions];
(ix) section 235 [alternative municipal tax collection scheme], and

Division 5 – Public Hearings

Public hearings – Local Government Act

13  (1) A public hearing under Part 14 [Planning and Land Use Management] or 15 [Heritage Conservation] of the Local Government Act, including a public hearing under section 29 (1) (b) [land use and subdivision regulation] of the Islands Trust Act, may be conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) For the purposes of providing notice of a public hearing to be conducted under subsection (1),
(a) any notice of the public hearing must include instructions for how to participate in the public hearing by means of electronic or other communication facilities,
(b) any material that is to be made available for public inspection for the purposes of the public hearing may be made available online or otherwise by means of electronic or other communication facilities, and
(c) a reference to the place of a public hearing includes a public hearing that is conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(3) This section applies to delegated public hearings.

(4) This section applies despite the following provisions:
(a) section 124 [procedure bylaws] of the Community Charter;
(b) section 225 [procedure bylaws] of the Local Government Act;
(c) section 11 [application of Community Charter and Local Government Act to trust bodies] of the Islands Trust Regulation, B.C. Reg. 119/90;
(d) section 2 [electronic meetings authorized] of the Islands Trust Electronic Meetings Regulation, B.C. Reg. 283/2009;
(e) any applicable requirements in a procedure bylaw made under the Community Charter, the Local Government Act or the Islands Trust Act.

Public hearings – Vancouver Charter

14  (1) A public hearing under Division 2 [Planning and Development] of Part 27 [Planning and Development] of the Vancouver Charter may be conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(2) For the purposes of providing notice of a public hearing to be conducted under subsection (1),
(a) any notice of the public hearing must include instructions for how to participate in the public hearing by means of electronic or other communication facilities,
(b) any material that is to be made available for public inspection for the purposes of the public hearing may be made available online or otherwise by means of electronic or other communication facilities, and
(c) a reference to the place of a public hearing includes a public hearing that is conducted by means of electronic or other communication facilities.

(3) This section applies despite
(a) section 566 [amendment or repeal of zoning by-law] of the Vancouver Charter, and
(b) any applicable provision in the Vancouver procedure bylaw.

Division 6 – Deferral of Annual Requirements

Annual general meeting and requirements – improvement districts

15 (1) An improvement district may defer an annual general meeting that is required under section 690 [annual general meeting – improvement districts] of the Local Government Act to a date not later than December 31, 2020.

(2) An improvement district may defer the preparation of financial statements required under section 691 [annual financial statements] of the Local Government Act to a date not later than December 31, 2020.

(3) Despite the date referred to in section 691 (5) of the Local Government Act, an improvement district may submit to the inspector the audited financial statements of the improvement district for the preceding year and any other financial information required by the inspector at the time of the annual general meeting of the improvement district.

(4) If an annual general meeting of an improvement district is deferred under subsection (1) of this section and the term of an improvement district trustee would be expiring and the vacancy filled at that meeting, the term of the improvement district trustee is extended until the annual general meeting is held.

(5) This section applies despite
(a) Division 3 [Governance and Organization] of Part 17 [Improvement Districts] of the Local Government Act, and
(b) any applicable provisions in a letters patent for an improvement district.
- We received our monthly water supply update. The regional water system will be moving to stage 2 watering restrictions as of July 10th (the date of this report). Below is a graph showing when we have moved to the different water restrictions over the past few years. We are now relying on storage behind the dams at Chapman and Edwards lakes. Summer rains will drive our water supply and restrictions for the next several months. The second well has been drilled at Church Road, so now we wait for the results of the AAP to proceed with borrowing for all the construction required to tie the water into the regional system.

- Funding for a feasibility study for the Langdale wastewater treatment plant has been approved. Parts of that plant have failed, resulting in that system being tied into the YMCA facilities for additional treatment. It needs to be determined whether the system can be repaired, upgraded, or whether the two systems should be permanently connected, including the costs and ownership implications.

- An update was received on the ground disturbances at the landfill. Staff are going to report back with further details, including costs for remediation, and whether we try and build a drop off facility that can be used as a transfer station into the future once the landfill is closed.

Corporate and Administrative Services Committee Meeting June 25th, 2020:

- The annual report was received, and approved for distribution. It’s available at [http://www.scrd.ca/Annual-Reports](http://www.scrd.ca/Annual-Reports).

- The SOFI report was also received from the auditors. This report includes information about the SCRD’s financial position, including assets and liabilities, as well as salaries over $75,000 and directors’ salaries and expenses for the year. The total Board remuneration for 2019 was $298,512.

- We had our 2020 budget debrief, talked about what worked and what didn’t, and approved a timeline for the 2021 budget cycle. Directors emphasized the need for enhanced communication with the public leading into the budget, so they’re less surprised at the end when the numbers are released. The SCRD has taken on a lot of services over the years that many other regional districts simply don’t manage. Do we continue to run those, or do we try to divest ourselves of some of that responsibility? It’s going to come down to what the community is truly willing to pay for. Pre-budget meetings will be scheduled for November 5th and 6th, 2020.

- Staff brought forward a plan to remediate a portion of the drop-off area at the landfill, and to close the remainder of the area to the public. This will have access implications, and require a taxation increase for 2021 to cover the shortfall for the landfill expenses (savings at the landfill have been related to closure costs, not emerging issues).
CRD Board Meeting June 25th, 2020:

- Received an update from the CAO. Dean McKinley is trying to make sure his reports are in written form, but sometimes the workload doesn’t always allow for it. The CRD has been focused on restart, and how to coordinate those activities with the other local governments.

- Adopted a minor zoning bylaw amendment in the rural area to permit a second dwelling on a lot that was otherwise ineligible.

Planning and Community Development Committee Meeting July 9th, 2020:

- Committee received a delegation Sunshine Coast Skating Club and the Minor Hockey association. They submitted a rather sizable document package (135 pages), in support of return to play for both of their programs. They are looking for assurances that ice will be returning as of August 4th as previously scheduled, but it’s too uncertain at this point. A staff report will be coming forward at CAS later this month looking at facilities restart.

- Received the Q2 Planning and Community Development report. Highlights include a rapid rebound in construction from the impacts of Covid, including a larger than usual percentage of the work in the Sechelt Nation. This is largely attributable to bigger, higher value commercial projects. Sports fields will also be reopening for programming soon, as well as community halls, once proper protocols are established. A new well was also drilled in Cliff Gilker park, and as long as everything tests out, it will be used to supply irrigation to the fields. This is the only irrigation well approved for 2020, though others are being contemplated.

- Telus received concurrence for construction of a new cellular tower to be located at the Roberts Creek firehall. This is an excellent opportunity for a partnership. Telus is willing to construct the tower, and will pay the CRD rent, and we will have an opportunity to install emergency communications equipment on the tower to improve services here on the Coast. It’s estimated that this tower will cost approximately $500,000 to build, so that is a great partnership opportunity for the CRD.

- Several provincial referrals were received and discussed, primarily around adventure tourism, and the impacts that it can have on our facilities and the environment. One was for Phantom Lake, where Seair Seaplanes would like to be able to fly people in for sightseeing tours, with a small dock on shore to disembark. Ultimately that one was endorsed, with some advocacy proposed. One that was rejected was for Endless Biking, who wanted to utilize Sprockids park and the trails all the way to Roberts Creek. These trails have been built and maintained over the years by volunteers, and there is substantial concern over the wear and tear that commercial operations will cause, without any compensation from the companies.

- Staff brought forward a report regarding the Halkett Bay dock on Gambier island, which is located adjacent to, but not actually in, Halkett Bay. They residents of that area would like to rename the dock, as there is already a Halkett Bay dock in the Marine park, and there is some concern that in an emergency, the two docks could be confused. The proposal is going out for referrals, including to the Squamish Nation, to see if there’s an opportunity for dual-naming.

CRD Board Meeting July 9th, 2020:

- Second reading was given to the zoning and OCP amendments for the Secret Cove Heights development in Halfmoon Bay. This remains a controversial project, with split voting from the rural directors. At this point, the proposal is heading to public hearing. The public hearing for this project is scheduled for July 21st, at 7pm, to be held over Zoom. I will be chairing the public hearing, with Lori Pratt, as the director for the area, serving as alternate chair. It’s typical for the area director to sit as the alternate chair, with another director serving as the chair.
Upcoming Meetings:

Infrastructure Services Committee: July 16 at 9:30 am
Policing and Public Safety Committee: July 16 at 1:30 pm
Transportation Advisory Committee: July 16 at 3:00 pm
Solid Waste Management Plan Monitoring Advisory Committee: July 21 at 11:00 am
Corporate and Administrative Services Committee: July 23 at 9:30 am
Regular Board: July 23 at 1:30 pm
Sunshine Coast Regional Hospital District: July 23 at 3:00 pm
Agricultural Advisory Committee: July 28 at 3:30 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRESPONDENCE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 06-23, Letter, UBCM, Gas Tax Agreement Community Works Fund Payment</td>
<td>Forwarded to Mayor and Council</td>
<td>FOR INFORMATION</td>
<td>Pg 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 06-25, Email, Hon. G Heyman, BC Recycling Regulation Amendment to Include ICI Sector</td>
<td>Forwarded to Mayor and Council</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td>Pg 156 - 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 06-30, Email, T Logan, SDBA Wayfinding project Council Request</td>
<td>Forwarded to Mayor and Council</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td>Pg 159 - 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 07-06, Letter, B Anderson, BC Ferries Response to Schedule Concerns</td>
<td>Forwarded to Mayor and Council</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td>Pg 173 - 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 07-06, Email, Hon. B Jordan, Reply from Fisheries and Oceans Canada for Shellfish Stock Assessment</td>
<td>Forwarded to Mayor and Council</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td>Pg 176 - 179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 17, 2020

Mayor Darnelda Siegers  
District of Sechelt  
Box 129  
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

Dear Mayor Darnelda Siegers:

RE: GAS TAX AGREEMENT COMMUNITY WORKS FUND PAYMENT

I am pleased to advise that UBCM is in the process of distributing the Community Works Fund (CWF) payment for fiscal 2020/2021. An electronic transfer of $485,341.10 is expected to occur within the next 30 days. These payments are made in accordance with the payment schedule set out in your CWF Agreement with UBCM (see section 4 of your Agreement).

CWF is made available to eligible local governments by the Government of Canada pursuant to the Administrative Agreement on the Federal Gas Tax Fund in British Columbia. Funding under the program may be directed to local priorities that fall within one of the eligible project categories.

This year, the Government of Canada announced that the federal Gas Tax Fund transfer was to be accelerated and delivered in one single payment, rather than two half-payments. Therefore, this will be the only transfer this year for CWF funding.

Further details regarding use of CWF and project eligibility are outlined in your CWF Agreement and details on the Gas Tax Agreement can be found on our website at www.ubcm.ca.

For further information, please contact Gas Tax Program Services by e-mail at gastax@ubcm.ca or by phone at 250-356-5134.

Yours truly,

Maja Tait  
UBCM President

Pc: David Douglas, Director of Financial Services
From: Minister, ENV ENV:EX <ENV.Minister@gov.bc.ca>
Sent: June 25, 2020 9:41 AM
To: 'mayor@gibsons.ca' <mayor@gibsons.ca>; Darnelda Siegers <Siegers@sechelt.ca>
    'lori.pratt@scrd.ca' <lori.pratt@scrd.ca>
Subject: RE: BC Recycling Regulation Amendment to Include ICI Sector

Reference: 358238

June 25, 2020

His Worship Mayor Bill Beamish
    and Councillors
Town of Gibsons
PO Box 340
Gibsons BC  V0N 1V0
Sent via email: mayor@gibsons.ca

Lori Pratt, Chair
    and Directors
Sunshine Coast Regional District
1975 Field Road
Sechelt BC  V0N 3A1
Sent via email: lori.pratt@scrd.ca

Her Worship Mayor Darnelda Siegers
    and Councillors
District of Sechelt
PO Box 129
Sechelt BC  V0N 3A0
Sent via email: siegers@sechelt.ca

Dear Mayor Beamish, Mayor Siegers and Chair Pratt:

Please see the attached letter from the Honourable George Heyman, Minister of Environment
    and Climate Change Strategy. A hard copy will not follow by mail.
June 25, 2020

His Worship Mayor Bill Beamish and Councillors
Town of Gibsons
PO Box 340
Gibsons BC V0N 1V0
Sent via email: mayor@gibsons.ca

Lori Pratt, Chair and Directors
Sunshine Coast Regional District
1975 Field Road
Sechelt BC V0N 3A1
Sent via email: lori.pratt@scrd.ca

Her Worship Mayor Darnelda Siegers and Councillors
District of Sechelt
PO Box 129
Sechelt BC V0N 3A0
Sent via email: siegers@sechelt.ca

Dear Mayor Beamish, Mayor Siegers and Chair Pratt:

Thank you for your letter of June 1, 2020, regarding the Sunshine Coast Regional District’s (SCRD’s) request to amend the Recycling Regulation to expand the scope of packaging and paper products (PPP) to include the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector.

The SCRD’s continued engagement in Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) is vital to the programs’ success, and your comments regarding ICI generated packaging will be considered as we move forward with EPR in B.C.

My ministry has heard that both stakeholders and the public want more EPR programs. Based on the ministry’s 2019 review of potential products for inclusion under EPR programs—which included a product and services gap analysis to identify opportunities for EPR expansion—the ministry is finalizing a priority listing of products/categories to be addressed going forward. Once this exercise is complete, we will begin development of an outreach strategy on proposed priorities.

You may also be interested to know, the CleanBC Plastics Action Plan, released in 2019, sought feedback on new policy opportunities and proposed amendments to the Recycling Regulation, including the expansion of EPR programs. Responses were welcomed from all sectors of B.C. including the public, local governments, Indigenous groups and a range of stakeholders. The ministry will be releasing a “What We Heard” report and this feedback will help inform the appropriate policy or regulatory response(s) to address ICI generated waste and recyclables.
We appreciate the concerns you have raised regarding PPP material from the ICI sector and recognize that the proper management of ICI PPP is a challenge for local governments.

Work to explore new regulatory or policy approaches, including the PPP from the ICI sector, would be accompanied by further consultation with stakeholders, local governments, Indigenous groups and the public in advance of specific regulatory changes. We are committed to continuing and building on our continent-leading EPR program in a timely and effective way that responds to the clear message we have heard from local governments around B.C. about the importance of including the ICI sector.

Thank you again for taking the time to write.

Sincerely,

George Heyman
Minister
June 30, 2020

Mayor & Council
District of Sechelt
2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie Street
PO Box 129, Sechelt, BC
V0N 3A0

Downtown Sechelt Wayfinding Project

The SDBA has completed the Wayfinding proposal for Downtown Sechelt. See attached proposal. The SDBA has received approval from the Provincial Government to utilize a portion of the funding to complete the Cowrie St. signage (see page 9 of proposal) in the amount of $3900 as part of the original $10000 Rural Dividend Funding approved in 2019.

The SDBA is requesting:
- approval of the design that would be carried out throughout Sechelt once funding for the remaining signage is received (applications to funding organizations ongoing)
- waiving of any signage fees by the District of Sechelt
- in-kind installation support from Parks for the Cowrie St. entrance signage

The SDBA is open to feedback from Council on the design. Please note that the signage for Cowrie St. entrance will need to be completed and installed by November 2020 as per the Rural Dividend Funding agreement.

This signage will be beneficial as it will be directing visitors to Downtown Sechelt to shop at our local businesses which is crucial given the current challenges due to COVID-19.

Thank you

Theresa Logan
Executive Director
Sechelt Downtown Business Association
604-885-9611
sdb@dccnet.com

"To champion a Unique, Vibrant and Attractive Downtown."
Visit our website at www.secheltdowntown.com
Like the SDBA on Facebook!
SIGNAGE GOALS

SUCCESSFUL WAYFINDING WILL:
1. Attract people downtown to spend time and money
2. Welcome visitors
3. Support local businesses
4. Encourage walking
5. Increase awareness of attractions around the downtown core
6. Reflect Sechelt's West-Coast vibe
SIGNAGE SUCCESS

MEASURES OF SUCCESS

1. Increased visits and revenue to downtown shops and farmer’s market.

2. Visitor's Centre is easier to find (fewer calls for directions).

3. It's easier for the visitor's centre to give directions using names included in the signage (ie. ‘Sea Walk’, ‘Two Waters Trail’ and ‘Downtown Loop’).

4. Increased visits to Sechelt Marsh and Porpoise Bay Public Wharf.

5. The signs are easily adapted for seasonal or location changes.

6. The signs are well-maintained with maintenance taking place every other year.
BEST PRACTICE CONSIDERATIONS

**COLOUR**
70% minimum colour contrast

**IMAGERY**
Intuitive icons and arrows that point away from text

**FONT**
Just 3 sans-serif typefaces are used in wayfinding for 75% of all airports

**SIZE**
10’ of viewing distance = 1 inch text height

**CONSISTENCY**
Location names and hierarchy to be predictable and maps to be oriented to the viewer

**FLEXIBILITY**
Allow for location or seasonal changes (ie. Farmers Market)

**LEGIBILITY**
Low gloss, Minimal ledges, Easily scannable, 3 icons per location max ‘Downtown’ to be listed first
INSPIRATION

SECHELT BUS SHELTERS

BENEFITS
• Expand the landmarking established when driving into town
• Built by a local company in Gibsons (West Coast Log Homes)
• Consistent with other styles on the coast = a unified Sunshine Coast Experience
  • The Bakery outdoor seating
  • Gibsons RCMP office
  • Gibsons Landing Harbour Office
  • Ruby Lake Resort
  • Bonniebrook gazebo
  • Multiple homes on the coast

CONSIDERATIONS/POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS
• Cost prohibitive
  • Potential for In-Kind donations
• Maintenance required to clean and re-stain every 2-3 years for longevity and optimal appearance
  • Adopt a sign program
  • Capital budget consideration
LOCAL VENDORS WORK SAMPLES

WOOD STRUCTURES
West Coast Log Homes
Gibsons

METAL WORK
Roadhouse Custom Metal
Wilson Creek

SIGN DESIGN
Copperhead Creative
Sechelt

MAP DESIGN
Jana Curll
Sechelt
CONCEPTS

GATEWAY EXAMPLE
@Wharf & Dolphin
PROPOSED GATEWAY
CURRENT TURN TO DOWNTOWN

PROPOSED TURN TO DOWNTOWN
CONCEPTS

VEHICULAR EXAMPLE
@Wharf & Cowrie

PEDESTRIAN EXAMPLE
CONCEPTS

MAP EXAMPLE
@Cowrie & Trail

Map to include location of totem poles similar to the above
This information is based on concept designs for estimate purposes. Quantities, sizes and designs may change.

PROPOSED LOCATIONS

- GATEWAY ENTRY
- VEHICLE DOUBLE POST
- VEHICLE SINGLE POST
- VEHICLE REFINISH POSTS
- PEDESTRIAN SINGLE POST
- MAP + PEDESTRIAN SINGLE POST
- TRIANGLE TRIPLE POST
- METAL SIGN ONLY (no wood)
- PAINTED SIGN ONLY (no wood)

TWO WATERS TRAIL

DOWNTOWN LOOP

GATEWAY ENTRY

VEHICLE DOUBLE POST

VEHICLE REFINISH POSTS

MAP + PEDESTRIAN SINGLE POST

PEDESTRIAN SINGLE POST

DOWNTOWNLOOP

BEACH

FRIENDSHIP PARK

VISITOR CENTRE

ART CENTRE

SENIOR'S CENTRE

KINNIKINNICK PARK

GOLF & ARENA

CAMPGROUNDS

BOAT LAUNCH

COMMUNITY CENTER

HACKETT PARK

SECHELT'S DOWNTOWN

THE SHÍSHÁLH NATION

MAP OF SECHELT

HACKETT PARK

TWO WATERS TRAIL
THANK YOU

For any questions, please contact:
Theressa Logan
SDBA Executive Director
theressa@secheltdowntown.com
July 6, 2020

Darnelda Siegers
Mayor
District of Sechelt
PO Box 129, 5797 Cowrie St. 2nd Floor
Sechelt, BC V0N 3A0

Re: BC Ferries Langdale / West Vancouver Schedule concerns

Dear Mayor Siegers,

Thank you for your letter dated June 26, 2020 regarding BC Ferries’ service to the Sunshine Coast. We have been carefully watching the return of traffic to the ferry system and, as you note, increasing service levels as required. Last week, we announced additional sailings between Langdale and Horseshoe Bay, along with an expanded schedule to provide more spacing between the sailings.

The speed with which traffic has returned is unexpected. In response, we have restored service levels to eight round trips per day, far more than any model projected would be required this season. We are also making operational changes to improve on-time performance including giving priority to the Langdale vessel while in Horseshoe Bay, reopening the foot passenger walkway at Horseshoe Bay, and managing our loads for maximum efficiency during on and off-loading.

In the event traffic continues to climb above projections, we are assessing options to deploy more capacity to the route. Right now the constraint is trained crew. This past spring, when we would have usually hired our seasonal staff, we could not hire and train due to COVID-19. Now we must work with the available crew, and if we don’t have the correct number to meet regulations, we cannot offer the capacity. As a result, service this summer will look different across our system and it will not be possible for us to return to previous summer levels on Route 3 this year.

As with many other organizations around the world, COVID-19 significantly affected the financial performance of the ferry system. We have had to make difficult decisions to ensure we maintain critical service to all the communities we serve. As you have noted, communication is a cornerstone of navigating this unusual time successfully and together. We remain committed to helping the Sunshine Coast community recover from the challenges presented by this global pandemic. We wish to work side by side with the community to provide the best service we can within the constraints we face in the wake of this challenge. We will continue to seek conversation and input from leaders, our Ferry Advisory Committee, and the wider Sunshine Coast community. We intend to emerge strong and resilient, and we are doing all we can to protect the critical service we provide by remaining a financially sound organization.

Should you have any questions or wish to discuss our upcoming changes, please do not hesitate to reach out to us. We would welcome the discussion.

Sincerely,

Brian Anderson
Vice President
Strategy & Community Engagement
From: Kerianne Poulsen  
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2020 6:28 PM  
To: mark.collins@bcferries.com; kathleen.creighton@bcferries.com; brian.anderson@bcferries.com; sarah.fung@bcferries.com  
Cc: nicholas.simons.MLA@leg.bc.ca; mumford@telus.net; Board@scrd.ca; Councillors <Councillors@gibsons.ca>; council@secheltnation.net  
Subject: Letter from District of Sechelt Council

Dear Mr. Collins and Mr. Anderson,

Please find a letter from the District of Sechelt Council attached.

Take care,

Kerianne Poulsen  
Executive Assistant  
Direct 604-740-8479 | Cell 604-885-8488  
PO Box 129 | 2nd Floor, 5797 Cowrie St. | Sechelt, BC | V0N 3A0

I acknowledge that I work on the unceded homelands of the shíshálh Nation  
Be Calm. Be Kind. Be Coastal.

Take the Sunshine Coast Housing Needs Assessment Survey to provide your input on housing across the coast!
June 26, 2020

BC Ferries Services Inc.
Mark Collins, President and Chief Executive Officer
Brian Anderson, Vice President, Strategy and Community Engagement

Sent via email: mark.collins@bcferries.com; kathleen.creighton@bcferries.com
brian.anderson@bcferries.com; sarah.fung@bcferries.com

Re: BC Ferries Landale / West Vancouver Schedule concerns

Dear Mr. Collins and Mr. Anderson,

At the June 24, 2020 District of Sechelt Council meeting, Council unanimously supported reaching out to you and advocating for our community and the Sunshine Coast.

You are demonstrating an awareness of our needs by reinstating sailings and increasing turnaround times to address issues with on-time sailings. Thank you for your responsiveness to our community.

Earlier this week, some additional midday sailings were added for a two week period. While these changes are greatly appreciated by Sechelt residents, Sechelt Council believes that the implementation of Stage 3 of BC’s Restart Plan will further increase traffic levels. The economy of Sechelt is heavily reliant on tourism and we fear that reduced Route 3 capacity will limit our community’s recovery.

Our vision for Route 3 this summer is simple - provide the same level of service as last summer. This would include the additional sailings we had last summer and maintaining increased time between sailings to ensure ferries run on time. Sechelt’s tourism operators are ready to accept guests and our residents are ready to travel to the Lower Mainland more.

We are encouraged by BC Ferries’ communication throughout the pandemic. Thank you for making yourselves available to meet with local leaders and the Southern Sunshine Coast Ferry Advisory Committee. We hope this same level of communication with our Ferry Advisory Committee and our community leaders will continue as ridership increases and service patterns are modified through the next few months.

Regards,

Darnelda Siegers
Mayor

Cc: Nicholas Simons, MLA: nicholas.simons.MLA@leg.bc.ca
Diana Mumford, Sunshine Coast Ferry Advisory Committee Chair: mumford@telus.net
From: Minister / Ministre (DFO/MPO) <Min.XNCR@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>  
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2020 11:41 AM  
To: Kerianne Poulsen <KPoulsen@sechelt.ca>  
Subject: Reply from Fisheries and Oceans Canada / Réponse de Pêches et Océans Canada

Attached is the signed response to your correspondence addressed to the Honourable Bernadette Jordan, Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard. For your convenience, the response is reproduced in the text below.

Veuillez trouver ci-jointe la réponse à votre correspondance adressée à l’honorable Bernadette Jordan, Ministre des Pêches, des Océans et de la Garde côtière canadienne. Pour votre commodité, la réponse est produite ci-dessous.

Her Worship Darnelda Siegers  
Mayor of Sechelt  
PO Box 129, 2nd Floor  
5797 Cowrie Street  
Sechelt BC V0N 3A0  
c/o Ms. Kerianne Poulsen

Dear Madam Mayor:

Thank you for your correspondence of February 13, 2020, regarding your request for a shellfish stock assessment near the Davis Bay Pier. I regret the delay in responding.

As you know, we are living in unprecedented times, and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Government of Canada is taking action to help. As Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, I am committed to providing the Canadian fisheries sector the support needed so it can continue to provide the world with high-quality, sustainably sourced fish and seafood. To learn about the measures the Government is taking to support Canadians and businesses, I encourage you to consult the website for Canada’s COVID-19 Economic Response Plan and the Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) website for COVID-19 – Information for industry and partners.
DFO understands the importance of the fishery resource to all who depend on it for their sustenance, livelihood, and recreation. DFO manages all fishery resources with a cautious approach to ensure the long-term sustainability of Canada’s fisheries, and regularly reviews management measures to ensure they are relevant to current conditions and objectives. DFO shares your concern about the conservation of crab populations, and has a number of measures in place to ensure the conservation of this resource.

Crustacean populations are extremely fluctuant. Population densities vary year to year, primarily driven by environmental and oceanographic conditions. As a result, annual fluctuations in crab abundance are expected. To address those conditions, DFO employs a precautionary approach to the crab fishery. Under the current management strategy, applied to all harvesting sectors, only legal sized male crabs that have been sexually mature for one to two years are allowed to be retained by harvesters. These size and sex restrictions ensure a viable breeding population is maintained. This strategy is employed in all Dungeness crab fisheries in the Pacific region to maintain sustainable populations, including in British Columbia.

The Department has been conducting long-term monitoring programs in the Georgia Basin since 1988 to ensure there are no conservation concerns for Dungeness crabs in this area. Although there are no specific monitoring sites near the Davis Bay pier, Dungeness crab stocks are supported by larvae originating over broad geographic areas, and DFO is confident that monitoring sites in other areas of the Georgia Basin are representative of stock health in the area surrounding the Davis Bay pier.

Conservation continues to be DFO’s first priority in the management of all fisheries. After conservation, the Department gives priority to harvest opportunities for Indigenous fisheries for food, social and ceremonial (FSC) purposes. Once these priorities have been met, and if abundance permits, DFO offers recreational and commercial opportunities where possible.

Once again, thank you for writing. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your concerns.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

The Honourable Bernadette Jordan, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard
July 6, 2020

Her Worship Darnelda Siegers  
Mayor of Sechelt  
PO Box 129, 2nd Floor  
5797 Cowrie Street  
Sechelt BC V0N 3A0  
c/o Ms. Kerianne Poulsen

Dear Madam Mayor:

Thank you for your correspondence of February 13, 2020, regarding your request for a shellfish stock assessment near the Davis Bay Pier. I regret the delay in responding.

As you know, we are living in unprecedented times, and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Government of Canada is taking action to help. As Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, I am committed to providing the Canadian fisheries sector the support needed so it can continue to provide the world with high-quality, sustainably sourced fish and seafood. To learn about the measures the Government is taking to support Canadians and businesses, I encourage you to consult the website for Canada’s COVID-19 Economic Response Plan and the Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) website for COVID-19 – Information for Industry and Partners.

DFO understands the importance of the fishery resource to all who depend on it for their sustenance, livelihood, and recreation. DFO manages all fishery resources with a cautious approach to ensure the long-term sustainability of Canada’s fisheries, and regularly reviews management measures to ensure they are relevant to current conditions and objectives. DFO shares your concern about the conservation of crab populations, and has a number of measures in place to ensure the conservation of this resource.

Crustacean populations are extremely fluctuant. Population densities vary year to year, primarily driven by environmental and oceanographic conditions. As a result, annual fluctuations in crab abundance are expected. To address those conditions, DFO employs a precautionary approach to the crab fishery. Under the current management strategy, applied to all harvesting sectors, only legal sized male crabs that have been sexually mature for one to two years are allowed to be retained by harvesters. These size and sex restrictions ensure a viable breeding population is maintained. This strategy is employed in all Dungeness crab fisheries in the Pacific region to maintain sustainable populations, including in British Columbia.
The Department has been conducting long-term monitoring programs in the Georgia Basin since 1988 to ensure there are no conservation concerns for Dungeness crabs in this area. Although there are no specific monitoring sites near the Davis Bay pier, Dungeness crab stocks are supported by larvae originating over broad geographic areas, and DFO is confident that monitoring sites in other areas of the Georgia Basin are representative of stock health in the area surrounding the Davis Bay pier.

Conservation continues to be DFO’s first priority in the management of all fisheries. After conservation, the Department gives priority to harvest opportunities for Indigenous fisheries for food, social and ceremonial (FSC) purposes. Once these priorities have been met, and if abundance permits, DFO offers recreational and commercial opportunities where possible.

Once again, thank you for writing. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your concerns.

Sincerely,

The Honourable Bernadette Jordan, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard
Sunshine Coast RCMP - Q1 (Jan-Mar) 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY CRIME</th>
<th>Q1 2018</th>
<th>Q1 2019</th>
<th>Q1 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theft From Motor Vehicle Files**

| District of Sechelt                  | 23      | 8       | 10      | 14           | 25                |
| shishah Nation                       | 1       | 0       | 1       | 1            | n/a               |
| Town of Gibsons                      | 14      | 4       | 6       | 8            | 50                |
| Sunshine Coast Regional District      | 4       | 1       | 9       | 5            | 800               |

**Break and Enter Files**

| District of Sechelt                  | 13      | 9       | 25      | 16           | 178               |
| shishah Nation                       | 1       | 1       | 1       | 1            | 0                 |
| Town of Gibsons                      | 6       | 6       | 8       | 7            | 33                |
| Sunshine Coast Regional District      | 8       | 3       | 7       | 6            | 133               |

**ROAD SAFETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD SAFETY</th>
<th>Q1 2018</th>
<th>Q1 2019</th>
<th>Q1 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
## PROPERTY CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 2018</th>
<th>Jan 2019</th>
<th>Jan 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Theft From Motor Vehicle Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 2018</th>
<th>Jan 2019</th>
<th>Jan 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Break and Enter Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 2018</th>
<th>Jan 2019</th>
<th>Jan 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ROAD SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 2018</th>
<th>Jan 2019</th>
<th>Jan 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
### Property Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 2018</th>
<th>Feb 2019</th>
<th>Feb 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theft From Motor Vehicle Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 2018</th>
<th>Feb 2019</th>
<th>Feb 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheshish Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Break and Enter Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 2018</th>
<th>Feb 2019</th>
<th>Feb 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheshish Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 2018</th>
<th>Feb 2019</th>
<th>Feb 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category. This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
Sunshine Coast RCMP - Mar 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theft From Motor Vehicle Files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Break and Enter Files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROAD SAFETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
## PROPERTY CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>Q2 2019</th>
<th>Q2 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theft From Motor Vehicle Files

- **District of Sechelt**: 13 (2019) to 6 (2020) - 67% decrease
- **shishalh Nation**: 0 (2019) to 3 (2020) - Increase in 2020
- **Town of Gibsons**: 5 (2019) to 2 (2020) - 60% decrease
- **Sunshine Coast Regional District**: 6 (2019) to 7 (2020) - 17% increase

### Break and Enter Files

- **District of Sechelt**: 9 (2019) to 8 (2020) to 23 (2020) - 188% increase
- **shishalh Nation**: 0 (2019) to 2 (2020) - Increase in 2020
- **Town of Gibsons**: 9 (2019) to 6 (2020) to 9 (2020) - 50% increase
- **Sunshine Coast Regional District**: 10 (2019) to 4 (2020) to 10 (2020) - 150% increase

## ROAD SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>Q2 2019</th>
<th>Q2 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
### PROPERTY CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Crime</th>
<th>Apr 2018</th>
<th>Apr 2019</th>
<th>Apr 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft From Motor Vehicle Files</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Break and Enter Files</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROAD SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Safety</th>
<th>Apr 2018</th>
<th>Apr 2019</th>
<th>Apr 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
## Sunshine Coast RCMP - May 2020

### Property Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY CRIME</th>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th>May 2019</th>
<th>May 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theft From Motor Vehicle Files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th>May 2019</th>
<th>May 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Break and Enter Files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th>May 2019</th>
<th>May 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD SAFETY</th>
<th>May 2018</th>
<th>May 2019</th>
<th>May 2020</th>
<th>3-yr Average</th>
<th>% Change 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.
## Sunshine Coast RCMP - Jun 2020

### PROPERTY CRIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Curfew Checks</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Street Checks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Foot Patrols</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theft From Motor Vehicle Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Break and Enter Files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Sechelt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shishalh Nation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibsons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Coast Regional District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROAD SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive: Roadchecks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation Tickets Issued</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired Driving Files</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Non-Fatal Injury</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions: Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart identifies PRIME files for the month indicated, excluding files scored as unfounded, unsubstantiated, information, prevention, and assistance. Some files have more than one offence/category.

This document is operational and subject to change. It is not to be copied or disseminated without consent of originator.