*ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR*

A. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   (Opportunity for Introduction of Late Items)
   (Opportunity for Introduction of Late Items – In Camera Agenda)

   **RECOMMENDATION 1**
   That the Agenda of the January 3, 2013 Electoral Area Advisory Committee meeting be approved as presented.

B. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Electoral Area Advisory Committee – December 6, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 2**
   That the minutes of the December 6, 2012 Electoral Area Advisory Committee Meeting be adopted as circulated.

C. PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

1. Vernon / North Okanagan Safe Communities Unit
   - Report dated December 17, 2012
   - December Speed Watch Report

   **RECOMMENDATION 3**
   That the report dated December 17, 2012 from the Vernon / North Okanagan Detachment – Safe Communities Unit be received for information.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Bylaw 2573 – Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment [Backyard Chickens]**
   - Staff report dated December 12, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 4**
   That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that Zoning Text Amendment Bylaw No. 2573, 2012, which proposes to amend Regional District of North Okanagan Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003 to permit chickens within Residential and Rural zones, be given First and Second Readings and referred to Public Hearing.

   **RECOMMENDATION 5**
   That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that staff be directed to develop a document on best management practices on backyard chickens for inclusion on the Regional District of North Okanagan website.

   **RECOMMENDATION 6**
   That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that the proposed backyard chicken regulations be forwarded to the Regional Agricultural Advisory Committee for their input on other methods in which the public can be educated on the best management practices.

2. **Electoral Areas “D” and “E” Official Community Plan and Kingfisher Local Area Plan Implementation**
   - Staff report dated December 13, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 7**
   That the report dated December 13, 2012 from the Planning Department regarding Electoral Areas “D” and “E” Official Community Plan and Kingfisher Local Area Plan Implementation be received for information; and further,

   That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that staff be directed to prepare a report regarding incorporating the Agricultural Land Commission Agri-tourism provisions in Zoning Bylaw No.1888, 2003; and further,

   That the Electoral Area Directors provide guidance to staff regarding up to three additional actions as outlined in the December 13, 2012 staff report that could be undertaken in 2013.

3. **2013 Budget for RDNO Small Utilities**
   - Staff report dated December 14, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 8**
   That the report dated December 14, 2012 from the Utilities Engineer regarding the 2013 Budget for RDNO Small Utilities be received for information.
4. **Electoral Area Directors Meeting – Union of British Columbia Municipalities**  
   - Letter dated December 19, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 9**  
   That the letter dated December 19, 2012 from the Union of British Columbia Municipalities regarding the 2013 Electoral Area Directors Meeting be received for information.

   Registration and discussion ideas require submission by January 18, 2013.

F. **REPORTS**

1. **Sustainability Program Report**  
   - Staff report dated December 14, 2012

   **RECOMMENDATION 10**  
   That the Sustainability Report dated December 14, 2012 from the Sustainability Coordinator be received for information.

2. **General Manager’s Report**

G. **IN CAMERA**

   **RECOMMENDATION 11**  
   That, pursuant to Section 92 of the Community Charter, the regular meeting of the Electoral Area Advisory Committee convene In Camera to deal with matters deemed closed to the public in accordance with Section 90(1)(c) of the Community Charter.

H. **REPORT FROM IN CAMERA**

I. **ADJOURNMENT**
CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Regular Agenda – December 6, 2012

Moved and seconded by Directors Pearase and Foisy
That the Agenda of the December 6, 2012 Electoral Area Advisory Committee meeting be approved as presented.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Electoral Area Advisory Committee – November 8, 2012

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Fleming
That the minutes of the November 8, 2012 Electoral Area Advisory Committee Meeting be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED
NEW BUSINESS

Agricultural Land Commission Application
MUNROE, William and Darlene [File No. 12-0313-F-ALR]

Moved and seconded by Directors Pearase and Fleming
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors, that the application of William and Darlene Munroe under Section 20(3) of the Agricultural Land Commission Act which requests permission to have a second dwelling unit for farm help on the property legally described as Lot 80, DL 234, ODYD, Plan 1010 and located at 21 Riverbend Road, Electoral Area “F” be approved.

CARRIED

Electoral Areas “B” and “C” Official Community Plan Review Public Participation Strategy

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Fleming
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that the Electoral Areas “B” and “C” Official Community Plan Review Public Participation Strategy be endorsed.

CARRIED

It was noted that the last Electoral Areas “B” and “C” Official Community Plan Review was done in 2003.

Shuswap River Watershed Sustainability Plan Update

Moved and seconded by Directors Pearase and Macnabb
That the report dated November 20, 2012 from the Sustainability Coordinator regarding the Shuswap River Watershed Sustainability Plan be received for information.

CARRIED

It was noted that involvement of the Okanagan Indian Band and the Splatsin Indian Band in the joint working group will be addressed by staff to obtain comments and suggestions for the Shuswap River Watershed Sustainability Plan.

City of Vernon Annexation Referral

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Fleming
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that the annexation application for Lot 3, Sec 12, Twp 8, ODYD, Plan KAP19676 and located at 5718 Barker Road, Electoral Area “C” not be supported; and further,

That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that a letter be sent to the City of Vernon providing consent, under Section 13 of the Community Charter, for the extension of municipal sanitary sewer service to Lot 3, Sec 12, Twp 8, ODYD, Plan KAP19676 and located at 5718 Barker Road, Electoral Area “C” for health and environmental reasons.

CARRIED
Electoral Area Annexation Impact Study, Phase II Update

Moved and seconded by Directors Fleming and Macnabb
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that the scope of Phase II of the Electoral Area Annexation Impact Study exclude Stage 3: Social Analysis of the Work Plan and those resources be reallocated to Phase III: Protocol Agreement.

CARRIED

Draft RDNO Utility Acquisition Policy – 002-ENG-WTR

Directors were advised that comments on the proposed RDNO Utility Acquisition Policy need to be provided to the Engineering Department by December 14, 2012.

Regional Agricultural Advisory Committee – Electoral Area Representatives

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Pearase
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that the following Electoral Area Directors be appointed to the Regional Agricultural Advisory Committee:
- Director Fleming
- Director Fairbairn
- Director Macnabb

CARRIED

Fire Training Centre Policy Board – RDNO Representative

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Foisy
That it be recommended to the Board of Directors that Director Fleming be appointed as the RDNO representative on the Fire Training Centre Policy Board.

CARRIED

Local Government Leadership Academy – 2013 Leadership Forum

Moved and seconded by Directors Macnabb and Foisy
That the letter received November 1, 2012 from the Local Government Leadership Academy regarding the 2013 Leadership Forum be received for information.

CARRIED

Directors were advised to contact the General Manager, Electoral Area Administration if they wish to attend the 2013 LGLA Leadership Forum.

REPORTS

Advisory Planning Commission Meetings

Moved and seconded by Directors Pearase and Fleming
That the minutes of the following Advisory Planning Commission meetings be received for information:
  a. Electoral Area "B" – Meeting of November 28, 2012
  b. Electoral Area "C" – Meeting of November 28, 2012
  c. Electoral Area "D" – Meeting of November 27, 2012
  d. Electoral Area "F" – Meeting of November 19, 2012

CARRIED
General Manager’s Report

Internet Connectivity

- Seeking funding for high speed internet for Electoral Area “D” and “E” is still ongoing

Illegal Dumping

- The Committee was reminded to provide illegal dumping sites, ranked according to priority / severity, within the Electoral Areas to the General Manager, Electoral Area Administration
- It was noted that posting “no dumping” signs seems to help reduce the continuation of illegal dumping in problem areas

PETITIONS AND DELEGATIONS

Vernon / North Okanagan Safe Communities Unit

Moved and seconded by Directors Fleming and Foisy
That the report dated November 26, 2012 from the Vernon / North Okanagan Detachment – Safe Communities Unit be received for information.

CARRIED

The Regional Crime Prevention Coordinator provided an update on activities he has undertaken over the past month.

It was suggested that the Regional Crime Prevention Coordinator contact various community groups, particularly in the Ashton Creek / Grindrod area, to advise them of current programs and issues.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Certified Correct:

________________________________________  __________________________________________
Chair                                      Corporate Officer
Vernon/North Okanagan RCMP
Regional Crime Prevention Programs Coordinator

Report to the Regional District North Okanagan
Board of Directors

HAPPY NEW YEAR TO YOU ALL

Date: December 17th 2012.

- Attended the December Seniors Action Network Meeting, Peoples Place, Vernon
- Coordinator continues to visit Electoral Areas on daily visits and talks to residents and businesses regarding safety / crime concerns in their community
- Attended City of Vernon Safe Communities Volunteer appreciation Dinner at the Schubert Centre Vernon, Unit commitment.
- Continuing to promote the Block Watch program in the Electoral Areas.
- Met with Christine Silver ICBC area representative in Vernon, regarding Speed Watch and Lock out auto crime signage, leaflets and future updates.
- Attended Silver Star Mountain Ski Resort regarding Ski Watch program.
- Introduced 2 new Block Watch programs to RDNO Area B.
- Attended Sovereign Lake Nordic ski resort regarding recent auto theft crime.
- Liaising with Ministry regarding Block Watch signs in Mara and Herry Road.
- Coordinator liaising between community and RCMP, grow ops in rural areas.
- Coordinator continues to perform Lockout Auto crime in the RDNO areas.
- Coordinator prepares his lesson plan for the WITS anti bullying for schools
- Coordinator has prepared Internet Safety/ Cyber Bullying presentations.
- Coordinator prepares Drug Awareness talks at Community Policing office.
- Coordinator prepares Personal Safety talk for community groups.
- Coordinator gets daily crime updates from reading the RCMP occurrence logs.
- Coordinator reads and responds to RCMP emails on GroupWise system.
- Speed reader board from ICBC being used daily in the RDNO Electoral areas.
- Regular emails sent to Block watch contacts with updates and Crime tips.
- Coordinator has worked 14 days in December.
- Coordinator has taken 2 Bank Holiday days off in December.
- Coordinator has taken 4 Vacation days off in December
RDNO Area B (BX/Swan Lake) – Area C (BX Silver Star)

- Attended evening BlockWatch meeting with residents in Sandford Road hosted by BlockWatch Captain to explain new program, 6 residents in attendance.
- Herry Road new BlockWatch, 12 households participating, awaiting road signs.
- Commenced Ski Watch program at Silver Star Mountain Resort with a volunteer, 7 pairs of skis and 4 snowboards, security etched with driving license number.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion on Pleasant Valley Rd.
- Speed Watch program, driver speed awareness / education operation performed on 1 occasion during December on Silver Star Road, BX by Coordinator.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion in December on BX Road near to BX Park, due to community concerns regarding speeding motorists.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion during December on Pottery Road monitoring the school zone at Hillview Elementary.
- Met with Silver Star Events Manager, regarding future Ski Watch dates.
- Re-attended at Sovereign Lake Nordic ski resort and met and advised staff regarding recent theft from a motor vehicle. Lockout auto crime operation.
- Attended BX Dog park and spoke with motorists, Lockout auto crime operation
- Citizens on Patrol (two volunteers) spent 10 hours patrolling in the BX area. The patrols in this area are a regular and on-going part of the Vernon COP program.
- Citizens on Patrol are regularly checking the Community Gardens in Area B during Thursday, Friday and Saturday evening patrols, during December.
- Continuing community contact with residents in Keddlestone Rd / Deer Park/Wilson-Jackson Rd, regarding Block Watch increased involvement.
- Maintaining regular contact with the 9 Block Watch programs in the area, which gives Coordinator access to over 169 households / family members by the e-mail system and Block Watch Captains set up.
- Coordinator patrols and visits area 1 day a week, split into 2 morning/afternoon periods.

RDNO Area D (Lumby Rural) – RDNO Area E (Cherryville)

- Coordinator attended and spoke regarding Crime Prevention advice at the Seniors Wellness centre in Lumby.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion in December, on Mabel Lake Road, outside of Lumby, close to JW Inglis Elementary school.
- Coordinator attended at Cherryville Elementary School with the WITS program on 2 occasions in December and spoke to the K/1 students in classroom.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion in December, on Highway 6 Westbound, near to Frank’s store in Cherryville.
- Submitted Crime Prevention article for Cherryvillan monthly newsletter.
- Maintaining regular contact with the 1 Block Watch program in area, Whitevale Road, Lumby which gives Coordinator access to 16 households / family members
- Coordinator patrols and visits area 1 day a week, split into 2 morning/afternoon periods.
RDNO Area F (Enderby Rural)

- Visited Grandview Bench community contact to discuss any community concerns and to arrange Crime Prevention talk at Pot Luck supper at the community hall.
- Coordinator actively working to increase membership in the Grandview Bench/Hamley Rd area BlockWatch program.
- Continuing to support the Block Watch Captain in introducing the program in Mara and liaising with Ministry of Transportation/Highways regarding positioning of signs.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion in Grindrod during December, monitoring traffic over bridge and through area, 50k zone.
- Speed Watch program performed on 1 occasion on Mabel Lake Rd, Enderby during December, and monitoring traffic by Ashton Creek store.
- Attended Grindrod Elementary School and met with principle regarding future dates for the WITS program to K/1 students.
- Visited the Block Watch program and liaised with the Captain in Deep Creek, Mallory Rd, Enderby.
- Submitted my monthly Crime Prevention articles for the Mara and Kingfisher community newsletters.
- Visited BlockWatch Captain in Mara regarding Block Watch membership.
- Liaising with Block Watch Captain and small business owner in Grindrod regarding possible illegal activities and crime incidents.
- Maintaining regular contact with the 6 Block Watch programs in area which gives the Coordinator access to over 155 households / family members by the email system and the Block Watch Captain set up.
- Coordinator patrols and visits area 1 day a week, split into 2 morning/afternoon periods.

I submit this December monthly report and the attached December Speed Watch monthly report for your information and consideration,

Kind regards,

Roy Morgan.

Regional District of North Okanagan.
Crime Prevention Program Coordinator.
RCMP Community Policing Unit.

Office 250 550-7845 or Cell 250 9382260
**SPEED WATCH MONTHLY REPORT FOR December 2012**

**RDNO Speed Watch PROGRAM COORDINATOR:** Roy Morgan  
**PHONE:** 250-550-7845  **FAX:** 250-260-5866  **E-MAIL:** rmorgan@vernon.ca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations (Intersection/ Corridor/ Highway)</th>
<th># of Speed Watch Deployments</th>
<th>Total Vehicles Checked</th>
<th>Over 10 km/h</th>
<th># of deployments with police presence (2 or 3 strikes)</th>
<th># of tickets issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley Road/Rimmer RD B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Kamloops Road B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley Road/Vernon Christian school B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX Road by BX park C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery Road, Hillview school C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Star Rd, BX school C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell Rd/E.Vernon Road C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel Lake Road, near JW Inglis Elementary, Lumby D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitevale Road Lumby D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 6, near Franks store, Cherryville E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fork Road Cherryville E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 97N, Mara, near Putula Recreation park. F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel Lake Road, Ashton Creek store, Enderby F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindrod, Highway 97S F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel Lake Road, Kingfisher F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total visibility hours</th>
<th>8</th>
<th># of Warning Letters issued</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total admin hours</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td># of Active Volunteers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOURS</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td># of Seat Belt Surveys</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Locations chosen close to school zones and communities concerns regarding speed.
RECOMMENDATION:

That Zoning Text Amendment Bylaw No. 2573, 2012, which proposes to amend the Regional District of North Okanagan Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003 to permit chickens within Residential and Rural zones, be given First and Second Readings and referred to Public Hearing; and further,

That staff be directed to develop a document on best management practices on backyard chickens for inclusion on the Regional District of North Okanagan website; and further,

That the proposed backyard chicken regulations be forwarded to the Regional Agricultural Advisory Committee for their input on other methods in which the public can be educated on the best management practices.

BACKGROUND:

The keeping of backyard chickens is currently prohibited in the Regional District Electoral Areas for properties that are zoned Rural and Residential and have a lot area less than 1.0 ha. In recent years, many communities across BC and North America have amended bylaws to allow for the keeping of backyard chickens. Keeping backyard chickens has been permitted for many reasons. Localizing food production has the potential to increase food security and minimize household waste. Permitting backyard chickens on smaller lot (<1.0 ha) Residential and Rural zoned properties create a more sustainable community and provides families with a healthy food source.

The Board of Directors passed the following resolution on August 15, 2012:

“That staff be directed to prepare a report on Zoning Bylaw text amendments to allow backyard chickens in the Residential and Small Holding zones”

This report has been prepared in following up in that direction.

Backyard Chickens in Other Communities:

Backyard chickens in other communities are regulated through either zoning and/or animal control bylaws that address best management practices relating to the maximum number of animals, minimum requirements for coop siting and design, animal care and slaughter. To prevent conflicts, some jurisdictions limit the keeping of hens to parcels that are 0.2 ha (2023 m²) in size or larger. The slaughtering of poultry is generally not permitted through animal control bylaws, nor are the keeping of roosters or the sale of eggs allowed.
The following policies have been adopted where municipalities and regional districts have permitted the keeping of chickens in a residential setting:

- The number of chickens allowed in residential areas generally range from four to ten.
- The majority of municipalities do not allow roosters to be kept in residential settings. Roosters are not allowed because of the noise and they are not necessary for egg production.
- Structures for the keeping of chickens are generally required to prohibit chickens from running at large for their safety from vehicles and predators, to avoid making a nuisance for neighbours and to ensure that owners are in controls of the animals.
- A coop and enclosure (run) of approximately 1.3 m² (14 ft²) per hen is recommended by several sources as a best management practice for the care of backyard chickens.
- Many municipalities do not identify a minimum lot size for the keeping of backyard chickens. The lot size minimum that are suggested for four (4) hens range from 450 m² (Nanaimo) to 4000 m² (Vernon). However, most municipalities do require setbacks from property lines for the keeping of chickens. These setbacks vary widely from 1 to 15 metres.
- Most municipalities do not allow chickens and their coops to be in the front yard or even visible from the street.
- Some municipalities require registration of backyard chickens.

A summary of select local and regional government approaches to allow backyard chickens is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Number Hens Allowed</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (m²)</th>
<th>Rear/Side Yard Setback (m)</th>
<th>Distance from House on same lot (m)</th>
<th>Distance from House on adjacent lot (m)</th>
<th>Permit/Registration Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>2/4/10/20</td>
<td>&lt;2000, &lt;4000, &lt;8100, 8100</td>
<td>15.24/15.24</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>4.5/4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5/1.5</td>
<td>3 (from any door or window)</td>
<td>3 (from any door or window)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Saanich</td>
<td>5/8/10</td>
<td>&lt;1858/1858/4047</td>
<td>7.5/1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (from any door or window)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kootenay Regional District</td>
<td>Up to 15</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquimalt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5/1.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>2/4/No Limit</td>
<td>&lt;450/450/4047</td>
<td>1.5/1.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Bay</td>
<td>5/8/10</td>
<td>&lt;745/745/4047</td>
<td>6.0/4.6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.5/1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The East Kootenay Regional District was the only regional district identified that currently allows backyard chickens.

Several municipalities have experienced increased instances of bylaw complaints related to backyard chickens, including:

- The City of Kelowna, which allows up to 10 chickens on lots larger than 0.5 acres (2023 m²), received 22 complaints since 2002. The complaints were related to lot size (9), noise (7), chicken coop siting (3), chickens-at-large (2) and odour (1).
- The City of Vancouver, which allows up to 4 chickens on all properties, receives approximately 20 complaints a year in relation to the keeping of hens, mostly related to odour (due to improper siting of coops) and the keeping of roosters.
In some rural municipalities and regions, backyard chickens have been identified as a wildlife attractant and consideration has been given to regulations or guidelines designed to minimize residential agriculture-wildlife interactions.

**Pros and Cons of Permitting Backyard Chickens**

A number of municipalities do permit backyard chickens for household egg production as strategy for local agricultural production, including Vancouver, New Westminster, Victoria, Nanaimo, Kamloops, Saanich, Esquimalt and Vernon. Some of the benefits that other municipalities have identified include:

- chickens contribute to food security and provide a source of local, naturally produced food;
- chickens are family-friendly animals; and
- chickens are educational for families in terms of connecting people to their food system.

Vancouver Coastal Health has supported bylaw amendments in the Lower Mainland to allow for backyard chickens. Interior Health Authority (IHA) has guidelines (attached to this report) for keeping hens in urban environments. The guidelines note the potential for disease, safety, and nuisance issues to arise, but states that with careful management, backyard chickens that are well cared for provide a regular, convenient source of eggs that are rich in nutrients and allow families to know how the animals should be raised, fed, and treated.

Other municipalities have examined the issues and decided against permitting backyard hens, citing:

- wildlife conflicts;
- pollution and odour;
- potential for animal neglect (the BC SPCA is not in support of backyard chickens – opinion attached to report); and,
- the spread of avian diseases.

The City of Fernie, for example, permits small farm animals and chickens on Rural Residential zoned properties one acre in size or greater. Both Fernie and Golden decided against permitting chickens on smaller residential lots.

In rural jurisdictions, wildlife conflict issues are often cited as the primary reason for not permitting chickens in residential neighbourhoods. Incidences of bears killing chickens have been reported in the Kootenays. Since 2009, the Kootenay Boundary Regional District’s Bylaw Enforcement and Bear Aware staff have received approximately twenty official complaints regarding chicken/bear interactions within the Kootenays and Conservation Officers have responded to thirteen large carnivore incidents related to backyard chickens.

Finally, staff note that a laying hen’s productivity begins when they are 12 months old, but then tapers by the time they reach 24 months. The average hen’s lifespan is approximately 7 years, so in terms of food production and consumption, the average hen will be at their peak egg laying potential for 1/7th of their lifespan.

**CURRENT REGIONAL DISTRICT POLICIES:**

**Regional Growth Strategy Bylaw No. 2500, 2011**

The Regional Growth Strategy supports the concept of backyard chickens through the following policies:

*Goal AG-4: Encourage a healthy, accessible and resilient food system.*
Strategy AG-4.2: Consider developing policies and programs that support urban agriculture and small scale agriculture as a component of local food security.

Electoral Area Official Community Plans

Local agriculture is generally supported by the Electoral Area Official Community Plans. Amendments would not be required to accommodate backyard chickens in residential areas.

Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003

The Zoning Bylaw does not allow Restricted Agricultural Use on parcels that have a lot size under 1 ha (10,000 m²) and therefore backyard chickens are not considered a permitted use on these properties.

Building Bylaw No. 1747, 2003

According to provision 209(2) of the Building Bylaw, accessory buildings do not require a building permit if these structures are less than 10 square metres in building area, do not create a hazard and the building is sited in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw. The building of a chicken coop, based upon the recommended floor area per hen and a maximum floor area of 9.2 m², would not require a building permit.

Unsightly Premises Bylaw No. 2046, 2005

The Unsightly Premises Bylaw would apply to the keeping of chickens.

Noise Bylaw No. 908, 1990

Provision 4 of the General Regulations of the Noise Bylaw states that “No persons shall own, keep or harbour any animal or bird which by its cries unduly disturbs the peace, quiet, rest, tranquillity of the surrounding neighbourhood or the public at large”. The inclusion of backyard chickens into smaller properties than 0.25 acres may represent a noise disturbance to neighbouring properties. Permitting roosters on any residential properties would contravene this Bylaw.

PLANNING ANALYSIS:

This report is intended to explore the issue of permitting chickens (or more specifically egg laying hens) on Rural or Residential zoned properties for individual household use. It appears that there is an increasing interest among some individuals in the community for the ability to legally keep a small number of hens on their property in order to supply their family with eggs. This is part of an overall trend where people wish to participate more actively in their own food production. One of the factors contributing to this trend may be related to a desire by individuals to act in a more self-reliant and sustainable manner.

Size of Parcel

Many British Columbia jurisdictions do not specify minimum parcel sizes, relying on setbacks and siting of chicken coops and lot size thresholds that determine the number of chickens that can be kept. Smaller lots may have difficulty in meeting adequate setback requirements and provide more of a challenge in establishing appropriate siting for a hen enclosure. A minimum parcel size of 4047 m² (0.25 acres) for the keeping of four (4) chickens and 4047 m² (1 acre) for keeping 10 chickens is proposed in order to ensure that setbacks can reasonably be expected to be met and the potential for nuisance to neighbours be kept to a minimum.

Coops and Runs
For shelter and protection from predators, hens need an enclosed house, with a locking door, which is known as a coop. Chicken structures must be of sound construction to prevent vermin or predators from entering, as well as lessening the possibility of the escape of chickens.

Coop and run requirements are generally included in bylaw provisions and reflect good animal husbandry practices. The City of Vancouver requires at least 0.37 m² of coop floor area and at least 0.92 m² of roofed outdoor enclosure (Bylaw No. 9150, Section 7.16(a)). The City of Terrace requires that the coop floor area be a minimum of 0.5 m² per hen and also require a minimum of 1.0 m² of enclosed roofed outdoor space per hen. Niagara Falls does not specify coop and run dimensions, but does state that the chicken coop “shall be designed and constructed to ensure proper ventilation and sufficient space for the chickens and maintained in accordance with good animal husbandry practices and shall keep all vermin out”.

The attraction of pests to a hen house is as a result of easy access to food due to poor structural integrity of the coop or poor coop maintenance. The attraction to pests appears similar to other outdoor containers that hold food wastes such as of composting structures and garbage cans. In both cases, if they are property secured it is generally not an issue.

In order to discourage rodents and other pests who may be attracted by food scraps, the Bylaw is proposed to contain requirements that actively restrict the chicken coop to being constructed in a manner that prevents access to the building by other animals.

Public nuisance and health are potential concerns with permitting backyard hens in a single family residential setting. Some of the concerns are that they will bring disease, cause an increase in noise, generate unpleasant odours, and attract rodents, large carnivores and other animals. There is a potential for wildlife interactions caused by backyard chickens within the Electoral Areas. As a result, hens should be always enclosed within a coop or ‘run’.

Staff recommends the following coop and run building requirements that can accommodate up to 10 hens in an enclosed space, based upon best practices.

- 0.37 m² per hen
- Maximum height: 2 m (6.5 ft)
- Must be covered
- Secure open enclosures with a minimum 0.92 m² per hen

Coops should contain a nest box in which hens lay their eggs and one or more perches per hen. Hens also need access to outdoors, either by free ranging or by an enclosed space. A schematic view of a standard coop and outdoor enclosure (‘run’) are provided below:
Setbacks

Chickens produce noise that can, in some situations, affect neighbouring properties. When the keeping of chickens is limited to only hens the noise impact is reduced and generally limited to clucking, cooing and squawking.

Odours arise as a result of the accumulation of uneaten feed and chicken droppings. Four chickens produce approximately half the solid waste per day as the average dog kept in a backyard. Research on this subject did not reveal any significant issues associated with the keeping of household hens. A setback of 3.0 m from windows and doors of all residential dwellings is consistent with the approach many jurisdictions have taken to minimize issues of odour and noise.

Promote Best Management Practices

The appropriate care and wellbeing of animals is covered by Provincial regulations under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. Under the Act, a person that causes or permits an animal to be or to continue to be in distress commits an offence. An animal is considered in distress if it is:

- deprived of adequate food, water, shelter, ventilation, space, care or veterinary treatment;
- injured, sick, in pain or suffering; or,
- abused or neglected.

Enforcement of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, as it relates to the well being of animals, falls under the explicit authority of the British Columbia Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (BCSPCA).

The improper care or the mistreatment of hens can occur in both the backyard and commercial environments. Staff have provided, as an attachment, the position of the BCSPCA on backyard chickens. It is suggested by the BCSPCA that it would be beneficial for those who engage in the activity to have some mentoring.

---

Footnote:

1 City of Vancouver Staff Report to Standing Committee on Planning and Environment, Guidelines for Keeping Backyard Chickens, March 24, 2010; City of Terrace FAQ – Keeping Backyard Hens in the City of Terrace
Many communities that allow backyard chickens, including the City of Vancouver, City of Terrace and District of Saanich, provide basic information on hen husbandry, coop design, appropriate treatment and carcass disposal.

Interior Health Authority (IHA) has developed a document (see attached) regarding the potential health benefits and risks associated with backyard chickens in small residential lots, as well as recommended protocols. While supportive of the high nutritional value of free range eggs and the learning experience for families, IHA has stated concerns related to the level of care practiced and the minimum standards imposed in order to safely house backyard chickens.

Risks identified by IHA include the transmission of pathogens, improper disposal of waste, food safety and poor animal welfare practices. IHA has stated that the risks identified can be mitigated by an appropriate level of education on the practice of keeping backyard chickens and appropriate regulation.

Being mindful of public health issues, the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendment establishes limits on the maximum number of hens permitted per parcel and minimum coop and outdoor run areas per hen to ensuring adequate space to keep animals in a healthy environment.

The issue of abandonment can arise with any domestic animal. With the exception of dogs, the Bylaw Compliance Officer does not, under current regulatory framework, have the authority to capture domestic animals. In the case of chickens, even if this authority was granted, it should be noted that there are no boarding facilities to take the animals to.

Due to a number of reasons, including health and sanitation, slaughtering, butchering or sale of meat, eggs, manure or other products derived from the hens is prohibited in many British Columbia jurisdictions through animal control bylaws.

Bio-security procedures, as recommended by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), should be followed by owners of backyard chickens. Bio-security procedures are recommended by poultry care experts as necessary to prevent the spread of avian flu and other diseases among chickens and their caregivers. These include:

- Preventing contact with wild birds and other animals;
- Cleaning enclosures and equipment routinely and thoroughly;
- Cleaning clothes, hands, and footwear before and after handling birds;
- Spotting the signs of disease and reporting disease early;
- Limiting visitor access to birds;
- Requiring visitors to practice bio-security measures;
- Segregating new hens for at least 30 days;
- Segregating hens that have been at shows for at least two weeks; and,
- Obtaining hens from reputable suppliers.

Staff recommend that the Regional District promote best management practices on the care and keeping of hens and coop design, if the keeping of backyard chickens is permitted, and to refer to the Regional Agricultural Advisory committee, which may provide additional ideas regarding public education.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:**

Backyard egg production can contribute to a local sustainable and secure food supply. It can provide a source of food that is less dependent on transportation. It allows for the on-site recycling of kitchen scraps as a hen food source. Chicken manure can provide a source of nitrogen rich fertilizer.
FINANCIAL/BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no financial implications directly associated with the Bylaw amendment itself other than staff time to prepare the bylaw and the cost of advertising that is required by the statutory process. There are financial and capacity implications as a result of the change in regulation that remove the prohibition due to an increase potential for complaints and the resources necessary to respond.

PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS:

No new personnel are required to implement the staff recommendation. It is expected that existing staff can respond to complaints and building inspections, if required.

REFERRALS:

The report has been referred to the following for their review and comment:

**Solid Waste:**

Solid Waste proposes that information on Chicken Husbandry Best Management Practices be made available to residents which include direction on how to properly dispose of a deceased carcasses.

**Building Inspection:**

Building Inspection is supportive of keeping backyard chickens and can accommodate building permits applications and inspections for structures over 10m² in area with current staff.

**Bylaw Enforcement:**

The following comments were received from the Bylaw Enforcement Officer:

- There is concern related to only allowing chickens for egg production as chickens also make good companions, can be raised for food, are a means of pest control, reduce household waste, produce fertilizer, and can provide education about local agricultural production. As they are productive egg layers for a portion of their lifespan, can they not become meat birds or pets? Why are broilers, roasters, Cornish game hens, ducks etc. for meat production or pets not allowed? Free range meat birds are an excellent, healthy food source. Also many people raise ducks for egg and meat production. Not allowing roosters is great but this is always a problem as it is very difficult to sex young chicks. Some chicken keepers will find it difficult to dispose of roosters.

- Regulating coop size and citing will result in increased bylaw enforcement activities and costs. If the Regional District allows backyard chickens, it is expected that there will be an increase in the number of complaints regarding coop size, location, appearance and setbacks. Measurements from property lines can be difficult without legal surveys. When people know there are setback and area regulations for coops, they may be inclined to complain if anything about backyard chickens bothers them. The Regional District may also receive frivolous complaints regarding backyard chickens.

- Care of poultry is regulated by the SPCA and they are the agency that ensures poultry is adequately taken care of. Bylaw Enforcement suggests regulating “Poultry at Large” instead. An example of policy is ‘A person must ensure that hens do not run at large, stray or graze on any highway, park or public place and a person must ensure that hens do not trespass on any private property’. People may use portable chicken runs which gives chicken keepers the ability to move chickens so there is less impact to a specific area. This allows chickens to graze a larger area, similar to free range.
• If the Regional District allows backyard chickens, it is expected that an increase in the number of complaints regarding dust, noise and odour. The Board of Directors should consider regulating manure storage. Since 2006, Bylaw Enforcement received four complaints relating to poultry and birds, including two noise complaints relating to roosters, one for ducks at large and one for noisy and at large peacock. Birds can create a lot of damage to flower beds and gardens when at large and also leave droppings. In 2012, Bylaw Enforcement received a complaint from a Coldstream resident who stores boats and vehicles in an accessory building. Unfortunately, a neighbour's chickens began roosting in the rafters, resulting in expensive cleanup. This complaint was outside of the jurisdiction of the Regional District.

• It is suggested that the Board of Directors consider requiring chicken keepers to get approval of 51% of their neighbours prior to raising backyard chickens.

SUMMARY:

Backyard hens can provide many benefits to residents situated on smaller (<1 ha) parcels, including improved food security, decreased greenhouse gas emissions related to the transportation of food and contributing to a sustainable and resilient food system. This report provides recommendations on a Zoning Bylaw Amendment that would allow up to ten (10) hens within all Rural and Residential properties within the five Electoral Areas (‘B’, ‘C’, ‘D’, ‘E’ and ‘F’).

It is recommended that Zoning Bylaw Amendment No. 2573, 2012 be given First and Second Readings and referred to Public Hearing.

Staff recommend that the Regional District promote best management practices on the care and keeping of hens and coop design, if the keeping of backyard chickens is permitted, and to refer to the Regional Agricultural Advisory committee, which may provide additional ideas regarding public education.

Submitted by:

Anthony Kittel, Regional Growth Strategy Coordinator

Endorsed by:

Rob Smailes, MCIP

General Manager, Planning and Building

Approved For Inclusion:

Trafford Hall, Administrator
WHEREAS pursuant to Section 903 [Zoning bylaws] of the Local Government Act, R.S.B.C., 1996, Chapter 323, as amended, and Regulations passed pursuant thereto, the Board of the Regional District of North Okanagan may, by Bylaw, divide the whole or part of the Regional District into zones, name each zone, establish boundaries for the zones and regulate uses within those zones;

AND WHEREAS the Board has created zones, named each zone, established boundaries for these zones and regulated uses within those zones by Bylaw No. 1888 being the “Regional District of North Okanagan Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003” and amendments thereto;

AND WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 895 [Development approval procedures] of the Local Government Act, the Board must, by bylaw, define procedures under which an owner of land may apply for an amendment to a Zoning Bylaw and must consider every application for an amendment to the bylaw;

AND WHEREAS the Board has enacted the “Regional District of North Okanagan Development Application Procedures and Administrative Fees Bylaw No. 2315, 2008 and amendments thereto” to establish procedures to amend an Official Community Plan, a Zoning Bylaw, or a Rural Land Use Bylaw, or to issue a Permit;

AND WHEREAS the Board is desirous to amend the Zoning Bylaw to allow for backyard chickens (urban hens);

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of the Regional District of North Okanagan, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

GENERAL

This Bylaw may be cited as “Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment No. 2573, 2012”.

DEFINITIONS

“Hen” means domesticated female chicken that are at least four months old that are kept on a property other than an agricultural use as defined in the Zoning Bylaw.

TEXT AMENDMENTS

Amend Division Four, Section 401 of Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003 by adding Section 401.3 as follows:

3. Laying Hens

   a. Notwithstanding the provisions of this Bylaw, any lot that contains a single family dwelling or manufactured home and is zoned Rural or Residential (except properties zoned R.5) within the Regional District is permitted to possess:
i. a maximum of four (4) hens on properties which are less than 4047 m² (0.25 acres); and,

ii. a maximum of ten (10) hens on properties that are, at a minimum, 4047 m² (1 acre) in area.

b. No roosters shall be permitted on any lot zoned Residential or that is less than 1 ha (2.471 acres) and zoned Rural.

c. All hens must be completely enclosed within a building or structure that meets the following regulations:

i. A minimum of 0.37 m² floor area per hen, with the provision that the maximum floor area shall not exceed 9.2 square metres (100 square feet); and

ii. the height shall not exceed 2 metres (6.56 feet), as measured from the finished grade; and

iii. the setback from any door or window of any dwelling shall not be less than 3 metres (9.8 feet); and

iv. shall be located only to the rear or side of a single family dwelling; and

v. shall be screened and located to the rear of a single family dwelling on a corner lot; and

vi. the setback from any property line shall be not less than 2 metres (6.56 feet).

d. On all properties that have a lot area less than 4047 m² (1 acre), an attached secure open enclosure (run), with a minimum floor area of 0.92 m² per hen, will be required in addition to 401.3.c.
Raising Backyard Hens
BC SPCA Views on Urban Chickens

The BC SPCA is supportive of urban consumers seeking alternatives to conventional eggs produced by hens housed in battery cages. However, the BC SPCA does not feel it is acceptable for individuals with little to no knowledge or experience in chicken care to keep hens in their backyards in an urban environment. Instead, consumers are encouraged to purchase eggs from SPCA Certified farmers and other certified cage-free farmers who have professional expertise in the humane raising of chickens.

BC SPCA concerns regarding the keeping of urban chickens

1.) Potential owners may not have knowledge or skills necessary to provide adequate care to their chickens. Such care includes:
   ▪ The ability to recognize common symptoms of disease, injury, and parasitic infection in chickens, and knowledge of what to do to address such problems.
   ▪ The ability to humanely euthanize a chicken, or access to someone who can (e.g. a poultry veterinarian or experienced chicken farmer).

2.) Resources necessary for good health of chickens may not be readily available in an urban environment. For example, access to suitable nutrition and veterinary care may not be readily available in the community.
   ▪ Pet store bird feed may not meet the nutritional needs of chickens. Where will owners purchase the proper chicken feed in quantities suitable for a small backyard flock?
   ▪ Will urban small animal veterinarians in your community allow a chicken into their practice?
   ▪ Will owners know how to humanely handle and transport chickens to veterinary facilities?

3.) Hens can live for 8-10 years, yet their productive egg-laying diminishes significantly after the first year. Chickens may stop laying eggs well before they reach the end of their natural life. What will people do with birds that have gone beyond their egg-laying time-frame?

4.) Aspects of the urban environment are not compatible with keeping backyard hens. Examples include:
   ▪ Risk of attack from urban wildlife such as coyotes, raccoons, birds of prey, and skunks.
- Risk of attack from domesticated dogs or cats roaming in the neighbourhood. This may have the unintended side-effect of encouraging aggressive behaviour in dogs.
- Attraction of rats to chicken feed or to baby chicks.
- Lack of adequate disposal options for chicken waste and carcasses.

5.) Vancouver’s Animal Control facility and the BC SPCA’s Vancouver Animal Shelter do not have suitable facilities to house chickens that are surrendered. Nor do they have suitable facilities to accommodate birds that are seized from individuals who contravene sections of the community bylaw or the BC Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act.

6.) There are risks associated with chickens contracting avian flu. If there is an outbreak, pet birds are at risk of being included in the cull of all nearby urban chickens.

For more information on this issue, please get in contact with your local community council or the BC SPCA.

BC SPCA Farm Animal Welfare

Phone: (604) 681-7271
Email: farminfo@spca.bc.ca
Website: www.spca.bc.ca/farm
Backyard Chickens in the Urban Environment

Interior Health’s Public Health sector has prepared this document to guide your council’s review of the health implications of community residents raising chickens in their backyards for egg production.

This document is for informational purposes. There is evidence to be found on both the positive and negative aspects of raising backyard chickens. However, the evidence does not strongly favour any one position.

There are some potential benefits to food security by allowing backyard chickens, as well as potential disease, food safety and nuisance issues to take into consideration. Disease transmission, food safety and nuisance issues can be mitigated with proper hygiene and controls related to handling of chickens and eggs and proper maintenance of the surrounding environment.

Thus, Interior Health neither supports, nor is opposed to, allowing backyard chickens within municipal boundaries, if appropriate protocols are in place and enforced.

Points for Consideration

The following are specific items that should be considered regarding the potential benefits and risks:

- Risk for pathogen transmission (e.g. Salmonella and Campylobacter) is present, but can be mitigated with proper housing and hygiene when handling chickens and eggs.
- The risk of avian influenza development is not appreciably increased by backyard hen. Urban hen keepers should be encouraged to follow the advice of CFIA: Bird Health Basics - How to Prevent and Detect Disease in Backyard Flocks and Pet Birds.
- Backyard chickens present a learning experience for families and neighbours and foster an understanding of where food comes from. Children learn first-hand about food, biology, geography and community.
- Concerns related to noise, odour and fecal waste disposal can be minimized if proper practices are followed. Where properly set up, composting of chicken manure and bedding is a possibility. It should be recognized that failure to control aesthetic concerns may increase opposition to urban agriculture and lead to land use conflicts.
- Having chickens allows families to know how the hens producing the eggs have been raised, fed and treated.
- Backyard chickens allow regular, convenient access to eggs that are of higher nutritional value than non-free range eggs.
**Protocols**

Should a municipal city council allow backyard chickens, Interior Health’s Public Health sector encourages municipalities to introduce protocols as part of bylaws that permit backyard chickens. Protocols should:

- require mandatory chicken enclosures and construction standards
- limit the number of birds per household
- prohibit mixing of birds
- establish minimum feed control practices and enclosure cleaning practices
- outline safe disposal of waste (surplus eggs, feces and carcass)
- include rules to guide the appropriate keeping of chickens, including animal welfare, hygiene practices and transmission of chicken-related diseases
- establish limits on egg distribution (limit to personal use) and prohibition of sale of eggs
- prohibit home-based slaughter of chickens
- prohibit sale of chicken meat

Municipalities should also consider the implications for bylaw infrastructure related to the ongoing monitoring of the chicken bylaw (i.e. bylaw enforcement officers).

---

**For Further Information**

CFIA: Bird Health Basics - How to Prevent and Detect Disease in Backyard Flocks and Pet Birds

University of Maine Poultry Facts - Tips for Egg Safety from Farm to Table For Small Poultry Flock Owners.

Harrison, John. The Poultry Pages - Rats and Other Vermin around Chickens.

Gov't of Alberta, Agriculture and Rural Development. Checklist for Fly Control in Poultry Facilities.


Ohio State University. Ohio State University Extension Fact Sheet. Veterinary Preventive Medicine: Predators of Poultry.

Mother Earth News The Community Chicken Project
http://www.motherearthnews.com/eggs.aspx

TO: Electoral Area Advisory Committee  
FROM: Planning Department  
DATE: December 13, 2012  
SUBJECT: Electoral Areas “D” and “E” Official Community Plan and the Kingfisher Local Area Plan Implementation

RECOMMENDATION:

That the report dated December 13, 2012 from the Planning Department regarding Electoral Areas “D” and “E” Official Community Plan and the Kingfisher Local Area Plan Implementation be received for information; and further,

That staff be directed to prepare a report regarding the Agricultural Land Commission Agri-tourism permitted uses and Zoning Bylaw No.1888, 2003; and further,

That the Electoral Area Directors provide guidance to staff on two to three additional actions that could be undertaken in 2013.

BACKGROUND:

At the Regular Meeting of March 21, 2012 the Board of Directors adopted the updated Electoral Areas “D” and “E” Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 2485, 2011 and the Kingfisher Local Area Plan Bylaw No. 2484, 2011 on September 5, 2012. Both plans identify a number of policies and action items that work towards addressing issues and achieving community goals and objectives.

Staff has had discussions with Directors Fairbairn, Foisy and Pearase who have identified a number of actions as priority items for implementation in the short term (0-5 year time frame). Based on the number of projects currently underway and the existing capacity within the Planning Department, not all actions highlighted can be undertaken in 2013. Therefore, in preparation of establishing the Planning Department’s 2013 work plan we request that direction be provided on the top three priority actions.

In determining which actions should be pursued it is important to take into consideration the benefits or outcomes of each action item, the level of involvement required from other agencies, and the general time frame for completion. In light of the ongoing projects (Shuswap River Watershed Sustainability Plan, Electoral Areas “B” & “C” OCP Review and Regional Growth Strategy Implementation) the actual amount of staff capacity is unknown but this can be monitored and acted on in the second half of the year. The tables below provide a high level review on the implications and level of involvement each policy / action may require.
**DISCUSSION:**

**Electoral Areas “D” & “E” OCP**

On October 8, 2012 staff met with both Directors Fairbairn and Foisy to obtain initial direction on which action items are of interest for implementation in the coming years. Below is a list of the actions that were highlighted during these discussions. The Directors requested that they meet with their Advisory Planning Commissions to further discuss which actions were of high importance for their areas. The APC’s met in late October and their feedback has been incorporated into the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Action Item:</th>
<th>Jurisdiction/Partnerships:</th>
<th>Time Frame:</th>
<th>Benefits / Outcomes of actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.12 Support ALC policies for agri-tourism businesses.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Would involve a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw (3- 6 month process).</td>
<td>Increased business opportunities on ALR lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.18 Direct roads and utility corridors away from ALR.</td>
<td>Co-operative action: ALC, Province (MoTI roads &amp; utility corridors), Federal Gov (communication infrastructure), and RDNO.</td>
<td>On-going: when reviewing applications and referrals.</td>
<td>Preservation of ALR lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1 Designation of large areas of undeveloped land and crown land for resource use.</td>
<td>RDNO Official Community Plan Designation</td>
<td>Complete: As shown on Schedule B, B1 and B2.</td>
<td>Incorporates Crown Lands into the Official Community Plan area. If lands are released from the crown and or tenured the Resource Use designation will apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.7 Existing residential areas in Whitevale, in the trailer park in Cherryville and in the area north of Lumby, are not representative of the rural densities supported by the plan.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Preservation of rural lands and the rural character of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 Second dwelling for family members supported in some zones for affordable housing and to support aging in place.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Would involve a review of the Zoning Bylaw to see which additional zones would be appropriate to accommodate second dwellings for family</td>
<td>Increase the opportunities for second dwellings for family members within the rural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy / Action Item:** Appoint a Heritage Advisory Commission for all, or part of the Electoral Area.

**Jurisdiction/Partnerships:** RDNO & Heritage Societies.

**Time Frame:** Current (0-5 yr): 6 – 9 month process. Develop Terms of Reference & Populate the Committee.

**Benefits / Outcomes of actions:** Provides an opportunity for community input on matters related to heritage protection and conservation.

**Policy / Action Item:** Establish a Community Heritage Register for purposes of identifying heritage properties.

**Jurisdiction/Partnerships:** RDNO & Heritage Societies

**Time Frame:** Current (0-5 yr): This would be an on-going process.

**Benefits / Outcomes of actions:** A community heritage registry is an official list of historic places, specific to the community of the Regional District of North Okanagan which have been identified by the local government as having heritage value or heritage character.

**Policy / Action Item:** Support preparation of a Bicycle and Trail Network Plan.

**Jurisdiction/Partnerships:** RDNO, White Valley Parks and Recreation

**Time Frame:** Current – Medium (0-10 yr): The development of such a plan would take approx. 6-9 months.

**Benefits / Outcomes of actions:** A bicycle and trail network would increase connectivity within the rural areas, would support active living, provide social benefits, environmental benefits and economic / tourism benefits.

### Kingfisher Local Area Plan

On October 8 and 21, 2012 staff met with Director Pearase to discuss implementation of the Kingfisher Local Area Plan and the following actions were identified as priorities for the community:

**Policy / Action Item:** Review Public Boat Launch at river mouth.

**Jurisdiction/Partnerships:** RDNO, Fortune Parks, Recreation and Culture

**Time Frame:** Current (0-5 yr):

**Benefits / Outcomes of actions:** Identify partnerships, efficiencies and potential up-grades to improve existing boat launch.

**Policy / Action Item:** Develop Road Cross Section.

**Jurisdiction/Partnerships:** RDNO & MoTI

**Time Frame:** Current (0-5 yr):

**Benefits / Outcomes of actions:** Opportunities to identify and create better parking solutions and alleviate the public safety concerns that currently exist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / Action Item: Jurisdiction/ Partnerships:</th>
<th>Time Frame:</th>
<th>Benefits / Outcomes of actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.4.7 Prepare Long-Term Road Improvements Plan</td>
<td>RDNO &amp; MoTI</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Opportunities to identify and create better parking solutions and alleviate the public safety concerns that currently exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.4 Review Options for Public Launch and Moorage at Large Road.</td>
<td>RDNO &amp; Province</td>
<td>Current: feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3 Examine Solutions for Westside Septic Pump-outs. (Both Land and Water based options).</td>
<td>RDNO, MOE, IHA, Community</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Consult with Westside community association, Interior Health, MFLNRO to establish protocol for water based septic pump-out services (3-6 month process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.2 Consider Commercial / Industrial Land for Marine Facility.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Review of lands that could potentially accommodate the proposed use as well as consult with landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.3 Prepare Guidelines for Infill Construction and re-Construction.</td>
<td>RDNO, MoE, DFO</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1 Review Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003 Section 301.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>Current (0-5 yr): Would involve a text amendment to the Zoning Bylaw (3 month process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.2 Support Recreational Opportunities on ALR and Rural Lands.</td>
<td>RDNO</td>
<td>On-going through the review of applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY:

There are a number of action items that have been identified as priorities for both Electoral Areas "D" and "E" and the community of Kingfisher. One action which has been identified in both plans and by all three Area Directors is to carry out a review of Zoning Bylaw No. 1888, 2003 Section 301 as it relates to the ALC's permitted uses. This is an action that could be carried out in the short term, three to six month process, and provide benefit to all residents with lands in the ALR. Once staff have been given direction on which action items are to be pursued an assessment of how they fit within the 2013 work plan will occur.

Submitted by:

Laura Frank (MA. Plan),
Sustainability Coordinator

Endorsed by:

Rob Smailes, MCIP
General Manager, Planning and Building

Approved For Inclusion:

Trafford Hall, Administrator
TO: Electoral Area Advisory Committee  
FROM: Engineering  
DATE: December 14, 2012  
SUBJECT: 2013 Budget for RDNO Small Utilities  

RECOMMENDATION: 
That this report, dated December 14, 2012 and titled 2013 Budget for RDNO Small Utilities, be received for information.  

BUDGET GUIDELINES: 
The following "Ten Strategies to get it Right" endorsed by the Board on April 6, 2011 were used as a guideline in for the RDNO Small Utility 2013 budget deliberations to meet water quality standards in BC and ensure continued sustainability of each utility:  
1. Understand the link between asset management and water pricing  
2. Establish an Annual Capital Contribution for Asset Replacement  
3. Understand the needs of your customers  
4. Establish clear objectives for designing rates  
5. Understand the implication of using taxation  
6. Know where you are coming from  
7. Know where you need to go  
8. Build large models, make small changes  
9. Avoid rate shock  
10. Adopt a systematic process  

BACKGROUND: 
This report is provided to assist with discussion of the 2013 Budgets for the Small Utilities. These include:  
1. Grindrod Water Utility  
2. Gunter-Ellison Water Utility  
3. Mabel Lake Water Utility  
4. Mabel Lake Sewer Utility  
5. Silver Star Water Utility, and  
6. Whitevale Water Utility  

It provides a preliminary budget summary for each utility with a break down of revenue, operations and capital. Although the presented budgets reflect the budget status and recommended rate increases for each utility, slight changes may occur before the budgets are finalized. Engineering is working on amalgamation of the Small Utility Bylaws into one Bylaw to ensure consistency of service between utilities. The unique rate structure of each utility will be included as schedules in the amalgamated Bylaw.
File No.:
Re: Small Utility Budget Information
Dated: December 14, 2012
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GRINDROD WATER UTILITY (GRW) BUDGET SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>FP 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY VALUE TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCEL TAXES</td>
<td>(41,720)</td>
<td>(41,720)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL / PROVINCIAL GRANTS</td>
<td>(40,300)</td>
<td>(40,400)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES, CHARGES &amp; OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>(57,823)</td>
<td>(58,913)</td>
<td>(1,090)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS FROM RESERVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS FROM ACCUMULATED SURPLUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BORROWING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(139,843)</td>
<td>(141,033)</td>
<td>(1,190)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>FP 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAGES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>79,717</td>
<td>80,095</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT PAYMENTS</td>
<td>15,704</td>
<td>15,704</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS TO RESERVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS TO SURPLUS/NON-STATUTORY RESERVES</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>40,400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139,843</td>
<td>141,033</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRW BUDGET ANALYSIS:

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.

**GRW User Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screen Improvements</td>
<td>(99,543)</td>
<td>(100,633)</td>
<td>(1,090)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An average 1.9% user fee increase is proposed for the GRW due to a small increase in the operating budget and a commitment to transfer funds the operational reserves at a sustainable rate as the GRW users are vulnerable to significant rate increases if significant emergency expenditures are required. No increase to the parcel fee requisition is proposed.

**GRW Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screen Improvements</td>
<td>(40,300)</td>
<td>(40,400)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two projects for the GRW that have been endorsed by the Board to receive Community Works Fund grants with descriptions of the projects provided in the capital cost sheets attached to this report. A cost summary of the projects are:

1. Screen Improvements $32,500
2. Installing Sampling Stations $7,900

Total $40,400
GRW Debt Payments

Capital borrowing expenses are related to MFA payment for construction of the GRW system. There is no addition borrowing proposed for 2013, with respect to property acquisitions or other capital projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRW Debt Payments</td>
<td>15,704</td>
<td>15,704</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRW Transfers to Reserves

In budgeting for the GRW system, a continued commitment is building a sustainable operating reserve. Reserve levels remain targeted levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRW Transfers to Reserves</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRW ADMINISTRATION

Administration costs are projected to be the same with slight increases in the operating costs related to insurance and laboratory fees. There is no additional staff planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>19,880</td>
<td>19,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>59,837</td>
<td>60,215</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79,717</td>
<td>80,095</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUNTER ELLISON WATER UTILITY (GEW) BUDGET SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY VALUE TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCEL TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL GRANTS</td>
<td>(14,328)</td>
<td>(14,463)</td>
<td>(135)</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES, CHARGES &amp; OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>(6,074)</td>
<td>(6,074)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS FROM RESERVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS FROM ACCUMULATED SURPLUS</td>
<td>(14,328)</td>
<td>(20,537)</td>
<td>(6,209)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BORROWING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,452</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT PAYMENTS</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS TO RESERVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS TO SURPLUS/ NON-STATUTORY RESERVES</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEW BUDGET ANALYSIS:

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEW Requisition</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,328</td>
<td>14,463</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A $25 increase to user fees is proposed for the GEW customers due to assist in funding an infrastructure renewal project planned for 2013. No increase to the parcel fee requisition is proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEW Grants</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no grants for the GEW system available for 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEW Capital Borrowing</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no borrowing proposed for 2013 for property acquisitions or other capital projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEW Transfers From Reserves</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,074)</td>
<td>(6,074)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A transfer from reserves is required to fund an infrastructure renewal project (capital cost sheet attached), which will be repaid with moderate fee increases in 2013 and over the next few years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration costs are projected to be the same.
MABEL LAKE WATER UTILITY (MLW) BUDGET SUMMARY:

952 - MABEL LAKE WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY VALUE TAXES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCEL TAXES</td>
<td>(15,600)</td>
<td>(49,895)</td>
<td>(34,295)</td>
<td>219.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL GRANTS</td>
<td>(88,537)</td>
<td>(112,564)</td>
<td>(24,047)</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES, CHARGES &amp; OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFERS FROM RESERVES</td>
<td>(2,424)</td>
<td>(2,413)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BORROWING</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     |        |       |          |      |
| EXPENSES            |        |       |          |      |
| WAGES & BENEFITS    | -      | -     | -        | 0.0% |
| OPERATING EXPENSES  | 90,961 | 114,997| 24,036   | 26.4% |
| DEBT PAYMENTS       | -      | -     | -        | 0.0% |
| TRANSFERS TO RESERVES | -     | -     | -        | 0.0% |
| CAPITAL EXPENDITURES| 15,600 | 49,895| 34,295   | 219.8%|

|                     | 2012   | 2013  |          |      |
| NET                 | 106,561| 164,892| 58,331   | 54.7%|

MLW BUDGET ANALYSIS:

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.

**MLW Requisition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Variance</strong></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(88,537)</td>
<td>(112,584)</td>
<td>(24,047)</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 25.0 % fee increase and a $10 / campground site increase is proposed for the MLW. MLW faces a number of challenges including the requirement for additional treatment (likely UV) and infrastructure renewal projects. In 2013, a Master Water Plan will be completed for MLW to identify projects and provide an implementation plan. The fee increase for 2013 will assist in paying for the Master Water Plan study and will be directed to a sustaining capital reserves in the future. This system has no parcel fee requisition and none is proposed at this time.

**MLW Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proposed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Variance</strong></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15,600)</td>
<td>(49,895)</td>
<td>(34,295)</td>
<td>219.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two projects for the MLW that have been endorsed by the Board to receive Community Works Fund grants with descriptions of the projects provided in the capital cost sheets attached to this report. These projects will be completed at the same time. A cost summary of the projects are:
1. Screen Improvements $13,795
2. Deepening the Lake Intake $36,100
Total $49,895

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLW Capital Borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLW Transfers From Reserves</td>
<td>(2,424)</td>
<td>(2,413)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLW ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>28,669</td>
<td>27,652</td>
<td>(1,017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>62,292</td>
<td>87,345</td>
<td>25,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90,961</td>
<td>114,997</td>
<td>24,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration costs are projected to decrease slightly as the IS portion of the fees will be shared with the Mabel Lake Sewer Utility. There is no additional staff planned. Operating expenses include $25,000 for the Master Water Plan project.
SILVER STAR UTILITY (SSW) BUDGET SUMMARY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value Taxes</td>
<td>(55,038)</td>
<td>(55,038)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal / Provincial Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Charges &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>(282,074)</td>
<td>(284,917)</td>
<td>(2,843)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Accumulated Surplus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Borrowing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(337,112)</td>
<td>(339,955)</td>
<td>(2,843)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>243,291</td>
<td>253,678</td>
<td>10,387</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Payments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Reserves</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Surplus/Non-Statutory Reserves</td>
<td>23,936</td>
<td>23,270</td>
<td>(666)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>53,125</td>
<td>(6,875)</td>
<td>(11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337,112</td>
<td>330,965</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSW BUDGET ANALYSIS:

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.

SSW Requisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(337,112)</td>
<td>(339,955)</td>
<td>(2,843)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An 3.2% fee increase is proposed for the SSW due to an increase in the operating budget and a decrease in water use (hence projected revenue). No increase to the parcel fee requisition is proposed.

SSW Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No grants have been received by SSW for 2013.

SSW Capital Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no borrowing proposed for 2013 for property acquisitions or other capital projects.
SSW Transfers to Reserves

A slight decrease in the transfer to reserves is budgeted.

SSW ADMINISTRATION

Administration costs have increased, mainly due to an increase operating costs. These increases stem from increased operator time to operate the treatment system at the upgraded Mid-T utility, additional surveillance and operating costs attributed to Vance Creek Reservoir, phased infrastructure renewal projects and implementation of maintenance programs. In addition insurance and utilities costs have also increased. There is no additional staff planned.

WHITEVALE WATER UTILITY (WWW) BUDGET SUMMARY:

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.
An 4.5% fee increase is proposed for WVW due to the need to replenish the operating reserve that was utilized to fund emergency repairs in 2012. The parcel tax requisition remains the same.

### WVW Requisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58,778)</td>
<td>(61,399)</td>
<td>(2,621)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WVW Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13,688)</td>
<td>(12,807)</td>
<td>(881)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carry forward CWF projects include**

1. Well Improvements: $2,830
2. SCADA Improvements: $2,777
3. Reservoir: $7,200

Total: $12,807

### WVW Transfers to Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>2,188.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant increase to transfers to reserves is proposed to ensure appropriate financial resources are available for any future emergency repairs and long-term capital replacement.

### WVW ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>20,206</td>
<td>17,353</td>
<td>(2,853)</td>
<td>(14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>32,791</td>
<td>35,683</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52,997</td>
<td>53,036</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration costs have reduced due to changes in the Water Quality program delivery that will require less administrative time to undertake. Operating contract costs are increased to reflect actual. There is no additional staff planned.
**MABEL LAKE SEWER UTILITY (MLS) BUDGET SUMMARY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>FP 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Value Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal / Provincial Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants In Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Charges &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>(40,829)</td>
<td>(42,402)</td>
<td>(1,573)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers From Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers From Accumulated Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>36,376</td>
<td>58,563</td>
<td>22,217</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers To Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers To Surplus/Non-Statutory Reserves</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>(4,453)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40,829)</td>
<td>(72,640)</td>
<td>(31,811)</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MLS BUDGET ANALYSIS:**

The following tables provide more information on the summarized revenue and expenses.

**MLS Requisition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40,829)</td>
<td>(42,402)</td>
<td>(1,573)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An 3.9% fee increase is proposed for the MLS due to an increase in the operating budget.

**MLS Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(14,047)</td>
<td>(14,047)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A CWF SCADA project is projected to be completed in 2013.

**MLS Transfers from Reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(16,191)</td>
<td>(16,191)</td>
<td>(100.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant draw from reserves is planned to offset the costs of undertaking a revised Liquid Waste Management Plan.
Administration costs have decreased due to sharing of IT resources with Mabel Lake Water. Operating cost increase is due to the planned update of the Liquid Waste Management Plan. There is no additional staff planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
<th>Proposed 2013</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>20,126</td>
<td>19,181</td>
<td>(945)</td>
<td>(4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>39,412</td>
<td>23,162</td>
<td>142.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36,376</td>
<td>58,593</td>
<td>22,217</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by: 
Zee Marcolin, P.Eng.
Utilities Engineer

Reviewed and endorsed by: 
Dale McTaggart, P.Eng.
General Manager Engineering

Reviewed and endorsed by: 
David Sewell
General Manager Finance

Approved for inclusion: 
Trafford Hall
Administrator
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

Project Name: Intake Screen Improvements - CWF 47

Service: 955 - Grindrod Water System

Budget Year: 2013

Priority: Medium

Category: 

Description:
Grindrod Water Utility's intake is within the Shuswap River and since construction, sand has entered the intake screen and has caused consistent operational and water quality issues for this system. In 2005, vortex sand separators were installed before the treatment plant, reducing issues for the plant, however, sand still enters the wet well, which has resulted in pump failures and water quality issues. It is also probable that screen intake velocities do not meet Department of Fisheries entrance velocity for fisheries. RDNO would like to initiate screen modification similar to the City of Enderby, which included redesign of the intake screen with air purging to reduce sediment build up in the screen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and assessments</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>32,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 32,500.00

Signature: 

Name: 
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

Project Name: Sampling Stations - CWF 79

Service: 955 - Grindrod Water System

Budget Year: 2013

Priority: Medium

Category: Water Quality

Description:

The water quality sampling program in Grindrod currently samples from the pumphouse, the Mayberry Store, the School and Sure Crop. These four locations are all within the northern half of Grindrod and relatively close to the treatment plant. There are no sampling points in the southern half of Grindrod that represent the water quality near the end of the distribution system and no easily accessible locations to sample. Also, the school is closed in the summer and inaccessible for sampling. This reduces the number of samples collected during the summer to below legislative sampling requirements. With this project, RDNO will install 2 roadside sampling stations in the southern section of Grindrod to gather better water quality information within this community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>2,900.00</td>
<td>Current Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>Statutory Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>7,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 7,900.00

Signature: ____________________________

Name: ________________________________
Project Name: Replumb the pump chamber

Service: 958 - Gunter-Ellison Water System

Budget Year: 2013

Priority: Medium

Category: Infrastructure Renewal

Description:
RDNO contracts the operations of the Gunter-Ellison Water System to the City of Enderby (Enderby). Enderby has recommended to RDNO that the piping in the pump chamber should be replaced as it is close to failure with one junction failure occurring in 2010 resulting in a service interruption for the customers on this system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; installation estimate</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (25%)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 7,000.00

Funding Source | Total
---|---
Current Revenue | 2,166.00
Statutory Reserve |
Operating Reserve | 4,834.00
Grant |
Long Term Debt |
DCC |
Other |

Signature: ____________________________
Name: ________________________________
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

Project Name: Deepening Intake - Screen Improvements

Service: 952 - Mabel Lake Water System

Budget Year: 2013

Priority: High

Category:

Description:
This work will include increasing the depth of the intake from the current 12 m depth to 48 m and increase the screen size to fit the 250 mm screen and ensure the screen design meets the DFO Freshwater Intake End-of-Pipe Fish Screen Guideline. The work scope will include a study to obtain a depth profile of the lake in the vicinity of the intake, collect water quality samples at the proposed depth to ensure improved water quality and completing the construction work to deepen the intake and increase the screen size. The purpose of the work is to improve water quality to avoid annual Water Quality Advisories for the Community and to provide support to a Filtration Deferral application to Interior Health. This work is a combination of two Community works Grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials and construction</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>Current Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies &amp; Assessments</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Statutory Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>51,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less money spent in 2012</td>
<td>(1,805)</td>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 49,895.00

Signature: ____________________________

Name: ____________________________
**CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY**

**Project Name:** Well 2 Pump House Replacement

**Service:** 950 - Silver Star Water

**Budget Year:** 2013

**Priority:** High

**Category:**

**Description:**
Well 2 is the highest producing well at Silver Star and experiences artesian flow in the off season. The artesian overflow drains onto the pump house flow and is a safety hazard and creating drainage issues in the area. The pump house is over 25 years old and decrepit due to the seasonal flooding within the building. The work proposed for Well 2 would rebuild the pump house exterior to current standards, install an surface annular well seal to bring the facility into compliance with the Groundwater Protection Regulation and provide for proper capping to eliminate the constant artesian flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding pump house</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Seal installation</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Materials</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Contingency (25%)</td>
<td>6,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,125.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Revenue</td>
<td>33,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**

**Name:**

---

**Proposed Project**

**Regional District of North Okanagan**
**CAPITAL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY**

**Project Name:** Reservoir Circulation Improvements  
**Service:** 957 - Whitevale Water System  
**Budget Year:** 2013  
**Priority:** High  
**Category:** Capital Works - Funded by CWF grant 75

**Description:**  
The Whitevale Water Utility is a small water system owned and operated by Regional District of North Okanagan that has 92 residential customers. The system was constructed in the late 1970s. The main system components consist of a well, a 200 m³ (50,000 gal) reservoir and two distribution pumps to pressurize the system. The reservoir has one chamber and the inlet pipe and outlet pipe are located at the same location within 2 m of one another. This creates short circuiting of the disinfection process in the remaining area of the reservoir creating poor water quality. This water could be delivered to the customers, especially during high water use periods such as the summer or during a fire. This project will separate the inlet and outlet pipe and create a nozzle end to cause jetting and additional mixing. This project was a condition within the Interior Health Water Supply Inspection Report completed on Aug. 4, 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Installation</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>Current Revenue</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator and SCADA programmer</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Statutory Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Contingency</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>Operating Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: 2013 Funding</strong></td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry over Well Improvement (CWF 45)</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry over SCADA Improvement (CWF 53)</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12,807.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature:**  
**Name:**
### Proposed Project

**Project Name:** Transfer switch and SCADA improvements

**Service:** 722 - Mabel Lake Sewer

**Budget Year:** 2013

**Priority:** High

**Category:**

**Description:** Outstanding conditions of the Operational Certificate that was finalized in 2011 include Contingency Planning and flow monitoring. This project will include installing a transfer switch at the sewer lift station to accommodate any long term power outages (i.e. greater than a few days) as Mabel Lake experiences frequent short term power outages. The transfer switch will allow the connection of a rental generator from (whether for longer power outages to prevent overflows. To meet the OC condition of Flow Monitoring, the magmeter at the effluent collection tank will be connected to Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA). Currently, poor access during winter often means the RDNO does not meet the minimum meter reading requirements. Connecting the meter to SCADA will provide continuous meter reading and enhance the safety of the system providing more effective monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Less money spent in 2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Install transfer switch to lift station</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect magmeter to SCADA</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,047.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 14,047.00

**Signature:**

**Name:**
TO: Mayor & Council | Chair & Board | Senior Staff
FROM: Art Kaehn, Electoral Area Representative
RE: ELECTORAL AREA DIRECTORS MEETING

CONFERENCE FOCUS
A meeting for Electoral Area Directors is planned for Tuesday afternoon, February 19, 2013 and Wednesday morning, February 20, 2013 at the Executive Airport Plaza Hotel in Richmond. The intent is to hold the meeting in conjunction with the Local Government Leadership Academy to help reduce costs.

The conference focuses on issues of concern to Electoral Area Directors and provides an opportunity to discuss common problems and share potential solutions to the problems identified. Some of the issues that are under consideration at this time are:

- Infrastructure funding – Electoral Areas;
- Emergency Management;
- Small Water Systems.

Attached is a form soliciting issues for discussion at the Electoral Area Directors meeting. If you have discussion ideas to share, please fill out the form and return it to UBCM by January 18, 2013.

Who Should Attend?
The conference is open to Regional District Chairs, Electoral Area Directors and Administrators/regional district staff.

DON’T MISS THIS OPPORTUNITY – Register On-line Today

Register on-line at www.ubcm.ca and click on “Events”
OR
Register on-line at www.civicinfo.bc.ca at http://www.civicinfo.bc.ca/event/EAMeeting.asp
REGISTRATION FEE:  $155.00 (+ HST) = $173.60

- Session will start at 1 pm Tuesday
- Fee includes coffee breaks and Tuesday reception, Wednesday morning hot breakfast
- Deadline for registration is Friday, January 18, 2013
- Cancellation notice required five working days prior to event to receive a refund

VENUE:  Executive Airport Plaza Hotel and Conference Centre
7311 Westminster Hwy
Richmond, BC
Website: www.executivehotels.net
Phone: 604-278-5555 or 1-800-663-2878

ACCOMMODATION:

A limited room block has been reserved for conference delegates at the Executive Airport Plaza Hotel in Richmond. Please advise hotel staff that you are registering under the room block for the “Local Government Leadership Academy 2013” in order to receive a conference rate of $99 per night. You are encouraged to book as soon as possible, as the room block will be released on January 18, 2013.

If you have any questions please contact:  Ken Vance, Senior Policy Advisor
Ph: 604-270-8226 Ext. 114
E-mail: kvance@ubcm.ca
Soliciting Issues for DISCUSSION

Listed below are some issues for possible discussion at the Electoral Area Directors Meeting. Please check-off those issues you would be interested in discussing:

- INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING – ELECTORAL AREAS
- EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
- SMALL WATER SYSTEMS
- MUNICIPAL AUDITOR GENERAL
- REGIONAL DISTRICT – PRIMER

Please identify any other issues that you would like to raise for discussion or would like to see included on the agenda at the Electoral Area Directors Meeting.

I would like to talk about:

ISSUE #1 (EXPLAIN):

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

REASON FOR DISCUSSING ISSUE

☐ GET IDEAS
☐ GET HELP
☐ SHARE OUR EXPERIENCE

ISSUE #2 (EXPLAIN):

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

REASON FOR DISCUSSING ISSUE

☐ GET IDEAS
☐ GET HELP
☐ SHARE OUR EXPERIENCE

ISSUE #3 (EXPLAIN):

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

REASON FOR DISCUSSING ISSUE

☐ GET IDEAS
☐ GET HELP
☐ SHARE OUR EXPERIENCE
Thank you very much for your input.

NAME: _______________________________________________________________________________

REGIONAL DISTRICT: __________________________________________________________________

PHONE: ___________________________ FAX: ___________________________

E-MAIL: ______________________________________________________________________________

Please please e-mail your response to kvance@ubcm.ca by January 18, 2013
RECOMMENDATION:

That the January Sustainability Report dated December 14, 2012 be received for information.

DISCUSSION:

1. RDNO Environmental Leadership Awards

The 2013 RDNO Environmental Leadership Awards are now open for submissions. There are six award categories that individuals, organizations and businesses can be nominated for:

- Community Clean Up
- Invasive Plants Control
- Parks and Trails Stewardship
- Sustainability
- Waste Reduction and Recycling
- Water Stewardship

Nominations close on Earth Day, April 22nd, 2013. Nomination information can be found on the RDNO website or by contacting the Sustainability Coordinator or the Waste Reduction Coordinator.

2. Inquisitive Clips

RDNO is once again partnering with the City of Vernon and SunFM to run the Inquisitive Clip competition. Inquisitive Clips is a competition for films less than 5 minutes in length, which convey a sustainability theme. The theme for 2013 is:

Sustainability in Your Backyard
From your backyard or beyond, what actions are you taking?

Submission information will be located on the RDNO, City of Vernon and SunFM websites.

The winners of the Environmental Leadership Awards, the City of Vernon Sustainability Awards and the Inquisitive Clips competition will all be announced at an awards ceremony held at the Powerhouse Theatre on the evening of June 3 as a part of Environment Week.
3. 2012 Community Works Fund Tier 1 Projects

In 2012, eight Community Works Fund (CWF) Tier 1 projects were approved for funding for a total of $50,099.00. The March Sustainability report included details on the first three. In the second half of 2012 an additional five were approved and are outlined below.

Project #071- Grindrod Water – Installation of Sampling Stations. Install two roadside sampling stations in the southern section of Grindrod to gather better water quality information for the Grindrod Water utility. Cost: $7,900.00

Project #075 – Whitevalley Water - Reservoir Improvements. Separation of the inlet and outlet pipe in the reservoir to prevent short circuiting of the disinfection process. Create a nozzle end to cause jetting and additional mixing. Cost: $7,200.00.

Project #077 – Lumby Pool Energy Efficiency Review. Review of the Lumby pool to identify potential energy saving options such as a blanket, solar heating, air to water heat pump etc. This project was completed in conjunction with the development of the Village of Lumby corporate carbon neutral strategy. The CWF project covered just the pool component. Cost: $600.00.

Project #079 - Kingfisher Hall Infrastructure Improvement Project Contribution. The Kingfisher Community Society applied for funding for an infrastructure project through the Federal Government Infrastructure Improvement Fund to undertake a number of initiatives including a geothermal heating system for the Kingfisher Hall. This CWF project was to assist with some of the remainder funding required. The Kingfisher Community Society were successful in obtaining the federal grant but may not require the CWF dollars therefore this project has not yet been activated. Approved $8,000.00.

Project #080 - Shuswap Agriculture Land Use Inventory and Water Demand Model Development - Phase I – Data Preparation. Preparation of the database and map sheets to be used during the land inventory survey based on cadastre and aerial photograph information. Later Phases of the project will include:

- Completion of a Land use survey to identify land use, crop type/land cover, livestock and irrigation method on agricultural land.
- Clean up survey data and digitize into a GIS database
- Connect land use information, soil type and climate data to water demand model
- Develop a land use report and a water demand model report for the region.
- Extra runs of the model can be carried out based on future scenarios e.g. future irrigated areas, climate change scenarios etc.

Cost: $8,000.00

4. 2013 Community Works Fund Tier 1 Projects

One Tier 1 Community Works Fund project has been approved so far for 2013.

Project #081 - Purchase and installation of a navian tankless water heater for the Lumby Fire Hall. Cost: $4404.85
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