

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
BRIEFING NOTE FOR MINISTER

Ref #: 156841

FOR INFORMATION

Date: April 23, 2015

Title: Mitigating the effects of natural resource-based industrial work camps

Issue: Understanding the effects of natural resource-based industrial work camps on communities and how they are being mitigated, especially in northern B.C.

Background:

B.C. has long relied on natural resources to fuel its economy. Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) presents a rare opportunity for the Province to build a new industry that will generate jobs, revenues to pay for health and education services, and long-term stability for families and communities. The provincial LNG strategy, *Liquefied Natural Gas: A Strategy for B.C.'s Newest Industry*, illustrates the Province's commitment to working with interested investors to have LNG facilities in operation by 2020.

Resource-based industrial development, especially in northern B.C., has been accompanied by the establishment of industrial work camps. Industrial work camps in B.C. typically accommodate temporary work forces in the forestry, mining, and oil and gas sectors. A 2012 inventory estimated that there were approximately 1,800 industrial camp sites in northern B.C.¹. As LNG investors make final investment decisions (FID) and construction of LNG pipelines and facilities begins, work camps for this new sector will be established.

Industrial work camps near or within communities can deliver benefits to those communities. They can also have adverse effects by placing additional pressure on local community infrastructure and services such as sewer, landfill, emergency and medical services (Appendix A). If the effects are not mitigated in some way, local governments are reliant on conventional mechanisms, including their tax base, to pay for the additional demand on services and infrastructure. In some cases, historical or conventional approaches to development, especially for large construction workforces can become problematic. For example, some communities have identified potential challenges for service delivery in relation to effects of work camps because the temporary workers living in camps are excluded from local census counts and are therefore not accommodated in conventional funding models based on population.

s.13

s.13

Proponents have different concerns, including concerns about escalating costs, gaining social license and ultimately building and operating their facilities and pipelines successfully. This note describes the approaches being undertaken to address the uncertainties experienced by the parties involved, and the role of MCSCD in supporting these cross-government efforts.

Mandate Considerations:	Liquefied Natural Gas Considerations:
--------------------------------	--

¹ Northern Health, October 17, 2012. Part 1: Understanding the State of Industrial Camps in Northern BC: A Background Paper.

Minister has a mandate to assess and make recommendations to Cabinet on the impacts and opportunities presented by the creation of LNG facilities and pipelines (which include work camps) on affected communities.	Important to the efficient approval of LNG project proposals.
Fiscal Considerations: s.13,s.16,s.17	First Nations Considerations: First Nations are required to be engaged through a process of consultation and accommodation with the authorizing authorities.

Discussion:

Local governments and service providers in northeast and northwest B.C. have raised concerns about the potential effects of work camps on community-level infrastructure and services. Their key concerns include (Appendix B):

- Understanding and mitigating the adverse effects of work camps on communities.
- Obtaining information about existing and proposed work camps including a camp's location, size, type and amenities.
- Clarifying and understanding the regulatory framework for work camp permits and approvals.

Historical patterns of resource development have been well-served by conventional approaches to planning for land use, infrastructure and service delivery. More recently, new resource development activity requires new ways of responding to the need for adequate community-level infrastructure and services.

The Province is undertaking new and regionally tailored approaches to addressing local government and service provider concerns in both the northeast and northwest. The provincial response is not a single uniform response; it is a suite of diverse initiatives that vary according to the scale and type of impact and the capacity in various communities and regions, and is characterized by two important features:

- It strives for customized solutions that reflect the unique social and economic characteristics of communities and regions, enabling them to make choices about priorities and long-term vision; and;
- Recognizes the fundamental role of partnerships in achieving success and prioritizes solutions that build partnerships and enable them to grow.

In northeast B.C., the expansion of the natural gas extraction industry has raised concerns about the ability of communities to prepare for increased infrastructure needs and sustain the associated population growth and demand for services. This activity has spurred an extensive regulatory and permitting framework that cuts across multiple agencies and Ministries, including the Oil and Gas Commission, WorksafeBC, the BC Safety Authority, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Environment (see Appendix E for full scope of regulating agencies).

In this region, MCSCD has also made a contribution in responding to those issues. In addition to supporting conventional taxation and infrastructure funding approaches, as it does with local governments province-wide, MCSCD also supports specific negotiated financial agreements in the region in response to the specific circumstances of industrial development and temporary workforce in rural areas. Chief amongst those is the Peace River MOU, which has provided more than \$302 million to the Peace River communities of Chetwynd, Hudson's Hope, Taylor, Tumbler Ridge, Dawson Creek, Fort St.

John and Pouce Coupe since 2005 to provide additional services and infrastructure resulting from demands of industrial growth. Discussions are underway to renegotiate the existing MOU and put in place a new 15-year agreement, providing certainty and stability and enabling MOU communities to adequately plan for future needs. In addition, the Infrastructure Development Contribution Agreement between the Province of BC and the Northern Rockies Regional Municipality represents the Province's commitment to reviving aging infrastructure, assisting in the capital growth of the region and the support of the Northern Rockies as the service sector for shale gas in northeast BC, supplying future Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) developments in the northwest.

Work camps in the northwest are subject to a number of the same conditions and rigours as in the northeast. Additionally in the northwest, and for pipeline projects originating in the northeast, a central initiative of the provincial approach is the Socio-Economic Effects Management Plan (SEEMP) process, managed through MCSCD. Some Environmental Assessment Certificate Holders are required to develop a SEEMP to mitigate the economic and social effects of work camps on communities by undertaking a coordinated process that engages the appropriate stakeholders – certificate holders, local governments, provincial agencies and service providers – in a discussion of the potential effects of work camps and related mitigations. In addition to mitigating effects of work camps, the engagement discussions are key to providing local governments with needed information about work camps. SEEMP discussions are expected to occur relatively early in the project planning / application process, providing local governments with time to create partnerships and plan for potential infrastructure and service effects. This requirement is in addition to other Environmental Assessment (EA) conditions requiring proponents to mitigate a wide range of adverse effects arising from the development of major projects, including effects of work camps that are not captured in a SEEMP condition.

In addition to SEEMP, the following initiatives comprise additional MCSCD programs/initiatives intended to address the three key concerns raised by local governments (Appendix C):

- The Community Readiness Working Group (CRWG) coordinates provincial actions for services and infrastructure in areas where communities may face extraordinary demands arising from major industrial developments. Members of the CRWG include representatives from the following ministries:
 - Advanced Education, Children and Family Development, Community, Sport and Cultural Development, Education, Environmental Assessment Office, Health, Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training, Justice, Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation, Natural Gas Development, BC Oil and Gas Commission, Social Development and Social Innovation, Transportation and Infrastructure and the Northern Health Authority.
- The Community Readiness Initiative including the Community Land-Use Planning Program (CLUPP), Asset Management Capacity Building (AMCB), Planning Intern Program, and local government/community outreach activities.
- Negotiated, customized tax agreements – e.g. taxation agreement between Pacific Northwest LNG and the District of Port Edward providing for full funding of infrastructure upgrades for sewer, water and main roads, and for a proponent contribution to a ring road bypass.

In addition, based on anticipated activity in the northwest, the Ministry of Health has introduced revised Work Camps Regulations (WCR) and supporting guidelines requiring operators of existing and proposed work camps to submit Notices of Operation and Environmental Health Plans.

Some local governments have proposed resource intensive solutions, such as a provincial one-stop oversight body to track and manage the effects of work camps on community-level infrastructure and services. By comparison, the current provincial approach represents a strategic and measured approach where the onus for solving specific issues resides with those who have the interest, motivation and capacity to address them; it respects the desire of proponents and communities to negotiate their own responses. The provincial approach targets financial contributions to specific local-level infrastructure needs. It shares the responsibility of mitigating effects among proponents, local governments, provincial and other service providers, and through its collaborative engagement approach shifts the discussion away from one that says “*you* should do this” to one of “how each of us can best contribute to the solution”.

Next Steps:

The topic of industrial work camps and how they relate to communities is complex, touching on numerous stakeholder groups, regulatory authorities, service providers, and jurisdictions. The Province has built its knowledge of the effects of industrial work camps and in response created tools to facilitate mitigations and move LNG certificate holders toward FIDs. This briefing note not only articulates the significant scope of provincial regulation in this area, but also clearly articulates the fundamental role that MCSCD has taken in supporting that framework. Developing this note has expanded the Ministry’s understanding of the complexities related to the regulatory context for industrial work camps, the need for partnerships and the kinds of effects and mitigations work camps generate.

It is clear that agencies across government are not equally informed about the scope of provincial activities in this area or better means to coordinate decision-making. As a next step, the briefing note will be presented to the Community Readiness Working Group (CRWG) and a discussion of its contents will be facilitated. The purpose of the discussion will be to further refine the information and analysis based on the practical “on the ground” perspectives of the regulatory agencies represented on the CRWG, and to build the collective capacity of the CRWG to understand and communicate consistently the provincial approach to mitigating work camp effects on communities.

Contact: Jennifer Hill
Meggin Messenger
Telephone: 250-387-0078
250-387-4045

Appendix A – An overview of industrial work camps and their potential effects

Industrial work camps have been and continue to be used in many resource extraction industries (e.g. forestry, mining, etc.). They are seen as a cost effective way to provide a combination of workplace and living space settings for companies to accommodate temporary workers. They also serve to mitigate the adverse effects of an influx of new residents requiring accommodation in communities close to industrial sites. There has been considerable discussion about work camps associated with increasing resource development in the Northwest particularly as it relates to the LNG industry; the effects of work camps on communities and service providers in a range of sectors are also experienced in the Northeast.

There are different types of work camps, including:

- closed camps – camps used by one proponent to house its workers;
- open camp – camps where the facilities are open to workers from various projects;
- dry camps – camps where alcohol is restricted;
- self-contained camps – camps that provide all necessary amenities and services; and;
- limited-service camps – camps that rely on other organizations, including local governments for services such as medical services, water, entertainment etc.

The form of construction and extent of amenities available at industrial work camps also vary. At the basic end of the spectrum, a work camp can consist of a collection of ATCO trailers. More sophisticated work camps can be lodge- or village-like facilities with private bedrooms and private baths, in-room TVs, “wifi” hot spots or multiple amenities such as movie theatres, libraries, weight rooms etc.

Camps will also vary depending on whether they are built to support pipeline or facility construction. Camps that support pipelines can be situated in very remote locations, and be operational for relatively short periods of time. They can be designed to be easily dismantled, moved and set up again to accommodate work crews as they progress along the length of the pipeline. Pipeline construction crews can be small with a need to accommodate 10s of workers, or larger in size, e.g. up to 1500 workers.

The location of a work camp can determine the kind of effect it imposes on a community or service delivery organization. Work camps for industrial facilities may be remotely located but can also be located close to communities, and sometimes within the boundaries of a municipality (e.g. Rio Tinto Alcan’s camp for the smelter in Kitimat). They may be temporary in nature, with the intention that they will be dismantled once facility construction is complete, or they may be designed for the longer term, for example, to provide accommodation after construction is complete for community residents (i.e. community legacy) or employees that operate the facility. The impacts of work camps on local governments will also vary depending on the size of the camp and level of services and amenities provided by the camp.

Work camps for the construction of industrial facilities can accommodate thousands of workers. As an example, PacificNorthwest (PNW) LNG, a LNG facility with an EA certificate, indicates that there will be a need to accommodate 3,500 to 4,500 people in a temporary work camp at peak construction. According to PNW LNG’s EA application, construction of the facility is estimated to take approximately four years. Camp operators may employ mobile work forces and transport workers in and out of the camps (see Appendix F for an overview of numbers of work camps and workers for LNG facility and pipeline projects). These kinds of camps are typically referred to as fly-in/fly-out, drive-in/drive-out, or bus-in/bus-out depending on the mode of transportation.

Appendix B – Key concerns about the effects of industrial work camps on infrastructure and services

Local governments and service providers have raised concerns about the potential effects of work camps on community-level infrastructure and services. The key concerns include:

1. Obtaining information about existing and proposed work camps including information about a camp's location, size, type, or amenities

Local governments and service providers have expressed concern that they don't know where or when work camps will be constructed or for how long they will be operational. Knowledge of the size, location and timing of the establishment of industrial work camps is essential to local governments to help them plan for development and anticipate the demands on community infrastructure, water, sewer, landfill, housing, emergency services, amenities and facilities. Access to this information will enable local governments to take advantage of the benefits or address the adverse effects of the work camps. The Ministry of Health has also identified the need to know about the location and timing of industrial work camps, and has responded by developing a new Work Camps Regulation and supporting guidance, which is described in Appendix C.

Local governments are also concerned about the need to respond to emergencies at or near work camps. A lack of information about the location, size and type of work camps could pose a safety risk. An overview of the regulatory framework for emergency response in relation to industrial work camps is provided in Appendix D.

Provincial responses that address this concern include: the proposed new Work Camps Regulation and its requirement to submit Notices of Operation and Environmental Health Plans with emergency response plans, SEEMP approach, Community Readiness Working Group and Community Readiness Initiative.

2. Understanding and mitigating work camp effects on communities

Local governments and service providers have expressed concern about the additional pressures work camps can place on local community infrastructure and services (e.g. sewer, landfill, emergency, medical services). These pressures often result because the workers living in work camps are excluded from local census counts (and sometimes referred to as a shadow population) and therefore they do not contribute additional revenue to the local government tax base to pay for this additional pressure on services and infrastructure. Research reviewing the literature on work camps reveals that the effects most commonly featured include community-life or social effects, for example, increased real estate prices and home rental costs, increased hospital visits and decreased perception of safety in the community².

s.13,s.16,s.17

² W. Beamish Consulting Ltd. & Heartwood Solutions Consulting prepared for Peace River Regional District, June 27/13, p.13.

s.13,s.16,s.17

While work camps can create extraordinary pressures on community services and infrastructure, they can also mitigate demand for some services, such as housing and related services. A self-contained work camp with high-quality amenities can reduce the burden on a community's services and amenities. There can also be positive economic benefits, such as the expansion of local businesses that service the needs of work camps or the workers (e.g. fishing charters), or employment and specialized training for local residents, in particular for aboriginal groups and communities with traditionally high unemployment rates.

Provincial responses that address this concern include: the SEEMP approach, proposed new Work Camps Regulation and supporting guidance, Community Readiness Initiative, negotiated, customized tax agreements including the Infrastructure Development Contribution Agreement – Northern Rockies Regional Municipality and the Provincial / Peace River MOU.

3. Clarifying the regulatory framework for work camp permits and approvals

Local governments have highlighted the challenge of understanding the complex regulatory framework for work camps, noting that multiple agencies are responsible for approvals and issuance of work camp permits and there is no inter-agency coordination supporting the framework. At the 2014 UBCM Convention, local governments put forward resolution A4: Worker Camp Permitting, requesting a single window approval process for industrial work camps. The Ministry response indicated that the issue of work camps is not necessarily a gap in the regulatory framework, but rather a need for improved communication and coordination between local governments, proponents and regulatory agencies to ensure a complete understanding of responsibilities and to ensure fair and appropriate responses. The response also described the SEEMP process as a way of achieving improved communication (Appendix C and Briefing Note Ref. #: 157913). Appendix E provides a description of BC's regulatory framework for industrial work camps.

Provincial responses that address this concern include: the SEEMP approach, proposed new Work Camps Regulation and supporting guidance, Community Readiness Working Group and Community Readiness Initiative.

Appendix C – Provincial approach to mitigating the effects of work camps

The provincial government recognizes the role the province has to play in supporting communities to respond to infrastructure and service demands that arise from major resource development projects. The provincial response is not a single uniform response; it is a suite of initiatives that vary according to the scale and type of impact and the capacity in various communities and regions. Taken together these measures strengthen the capacity of communities and regions to accommodate, and benefit from major resource development projects. The following is a description of the suite of measures in place to respond to the key concerns identified above.

1. Socio-Economic Effects Management Plans (SEEMPs) through Environmental Assessment (EA)

To help mitigate economic and social effects of LNG related industrial work camps on communities, some Environmental Assessment Certificate Holders are required to develop a Socio-Economic Effects Management Plan (SEEMP). The basis for the approach, developed collaboratively by the Ministry and Environmental Assessment Office (EAO), is that the economic and social impacts of industrial work camps on communities will be better understood through a coordinated process that engages the appropriate stakeholders – certificate holders, local governments, provincial agencies, service providers – in a discussion of the potential effects of work camps and related mitigations.

A SEEMP sets out an adaptive management process to identify and manage project related socio-economic effects, with a focus on community services and infrastructure. The desired outcome with the development of a SEEMP is to mitigate project related (e.g. work camps) adverse effects on communities and for a Certificate Holder to have access to services that are required for their business and workers.

In addition to mitigating effects of work camps, the engagement discussions that are a key part of the process to develop and implement SEEMPs provide local governments with needed information about work camps. SEEMP discussions are expected to occur earlier in the project planning and application process and therefore provide local governments with time to plan for potential infrastructure and service impacts.

In its response to the 2014 UBCM Convention resolution A4 Worker Camp Permitting, the Ministry replied that the issue of work camps is not necessarily a gap in the regulatory framework, but rather, a need for improved communication and coordination between local governments, proponents and regulatory agencies. The SEEMP requirement is one way that the Ministry is actively pursuing improved engagement between local governments, Certificate Holders and regulatory agencies to ensure a complete understanding of responsibilities and to ensure fair and appropriate responses.

The requirement for SEEMP discussions is currently limited to LNG facilities and pipelines that are part of the Environmental Assessment process. There is no SEEMP requirement to help address local government concerns about obtaining information for existing work camps, projects that do not require EA approval, or EA projects that do not require a SEEMP. Presently, SEEMPs are focused on LNG projects located in northwest BC and LNG pipelines originating in the northeast.

2. Ministry of Health Proposed Work Camps Regulations (WCR)

In response to the desire for more information about work camps, the Ministry of Health (MoH) is proposing a new Work Camps Regulations (WCR) to replace the existing Industrial Camps Regulation (ICR). The proposed WCR requires camp operators to submit a Notice of Operation (NOO) to the health

authority at least 10 days prior to construction of the work camp, or for camps resuming operations, at least 10 days prior to operation. The NOO is to include information about the camp operator, contact information, location, directions for access, duration and the number of residents being accommodated. Camp operators are also required to submit an Environmental Health Plan (EHP) to the health authority at least 10 days prior to operation of the work camp. The EHP must include information about the actions taken to ensure the health and safety of camp residents. Existing camps will be subject to the new regulation.

MoH is also developing “Guidelines for Work Camp Operations” to support the regulation. The proposed WCR / guidelines were sent to stakeholders for review in March 2015. s.13

s.13

s.13

An important amendment to the regulation is the requirement to include emergency procedures in the Environmental Health Plan. Camps will be required to have procedures in place to deal with medical, health hygiene, natural disasters, facility emergencies, resident related emergencies, and water treatment and sewage disposal failures. s.13

s.13

3. Environmental Assessment Process (beyond SEEMP conditions)

In addition to Environmental Assessment (EA) conditions requiring proponents to develop SEEMPs, the EA process can require proponents to mitigate a wide range of adverse effects arising from the development of major projects, including effects of work camps that are not captured in a SEEMP-related condition.

The Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) manages the assessment of proposed major projects in British Columbia as required by the Environmental Assessment Act (Act). The assessment process examines major projects for potentially adverse environmental, economic, social, heritage and health effects that may occur during the life cycle of these projects.

4. Community Readiness Working Group

The Community Readiness Working Group (CRWG) coordinates provincial actions for services and infrastructure in areas where communities may face extraordinary demands arising from major industrial developments. The goal of the CRWG is to enable decisions that support the combined efforts of local governments, provincial service providers and proponents to meet infrastructure, health, safety and social service requirements. The CRWG also monitors and collaborates on local government actions on services and infrastructure and provides feedback on industry actions on services and infrastructure.

Members of the CRWG include representatives from the following ministries: Advanced Education, Children and Family Development, Community, Sport and Cultural Development, Education, Environmental Assessment Office, Health, Jobs, Tourism and Skills Training, Justice, Aboriginal Relations

and Reconciliation, Natural Gas Development, BC Oil and Gas Commission, Social Development and Social Innovation, Transportation and Infrastructure and the Northern Health Authority.

5. Community Readiness Initiative

“Community Readiness”, which complements the SEEMP, is a broad coordinated response to changing service and infrastructure needs and impacts arising from extraordinary, peak demands during the construction phase of LNG and other major industrial developments. It includes the Community Land-Use Planning Program (CLUPP), Asset Management Capacity Building (AMCB), Planning Intern Program, local government/community outreach activities.

6. Negotiated, customized tax agreements

The Province is supporting the establishment of customized, negotiated local taxation agreements, where they add the most value. They will be customized to respond to differences among communities, their histories and aspirations and to differences across sectors. To date, a taxation agreement between Pacific Northwest LNG and the District of Port Edward has been successfully negotiated and signed on December 15, 2014. The agreement provides for full funding of infrastructure upgrades for sewer, water and main roads, and for a proponent contribution to a ring road bypass. Legislation is required to exclude barriers to the agreement; the Request for Legislation (RFL) and drafting are being expedited in order to have this for the Spring 2015 legislative session.

The Province is also exploring partnership contributions to the ring road bypass through Building Canada. The Province has also committed to regulating a 40% depreciation of capital value of large properties, which requires a regulatory change under the *Assessment Act*.

7. Infrastructure Development Contribution Agreement – Northern Rockies Regional Municipality

The Province has responded to concerns on the part of the Northern Rockies Regional Municipality (NRRM) that the potential growth of the shale gas industry will place significant demands on the community for housing, infrastructure and community services that it will not be able to meet through property taxes. The Infrastructure Development Contribution Agreement (IDCA) was signed in April 2013, allowing the Province to contribute up to \$10 million per year for twenty years, towards infrastructure to build a comprehensive service centre for the natural gas industry.

8. Provincial / Peace River Memorandum of Understanding

The Provincial / Peace River Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was announced in 2005. The MOU provides at least \$20 million annually, indexed to changes in the rural industrial assessment base, to the Peace River Regional District. The funds act as “grants-in-lieu”, as Peace River communities cannot access what would ordinarily be their municipal industrial property taxes. The funds support communities’ ability to provide additional services and infrastructure resulting from demands of industrial growth. Discussion are currently underway to renegotiate the existing MOU and put in place a new 15 year agreement, providing certainty and stability and enabling MOU communities to adequately plan for future needs. It is intended that a renegotiated agreement would extend to 2030.

9. Existing Financial Tools Available to Local Governments to Mitigate Some Effects

Property taxes

Property taxes are a primary source of revenue for local governments, and BC Assessment does reflect property improvements when assessing work camps. The amount of tax increase is dependent on the location, type of improvement and size. As long as BC Assessment is aware of a work camp it will be reflected in the property assessment, and the local government will receive increased taxes.

User fees

In addition to property taxes, most other local government revenue comes from user fees, senior government grants and developer contributions. Typically user fees and charges are used to recover the cost of services (e.g. sewer, water, garbage collection). Fees are often charged to applicants for building permits or licenses and are common when using public transportation, recreational facilities or renting local government property.

Senior government grants

Senior government grants can be conditional – funds transferred for a specific purpose that may not be used for any other project – and unconditional – funds that can be used for any purpose desired by the recipient. Examples of provincially managed conditional grants include infrastructure grants such as the Building Canada Fund and the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund. The primary unconditional grants to local governments are the Small Community Grants, Traffic Fine Revenue Sharing transfers and Regional District Basic Grants.

Developer contributions

There is a range of development finance tools available to local governments to cover at least a portion of growth-related expenditures, including development costs charges (DCCs), local service areas and taxes, density bonusing, latecomer charges and community amenity contributions (when used appropriately). These types of tools could be used by local governments where LNG facilities are being constructed within their jurisdictional boundaries.

In addition to the suite of provincial initiatives, proponents are entering into independent agreements with communities, service providers and First Nations to mitigate potential effects and provide benefits. One example is agreements between a proponent and local educational institutions to incorporate skills training required of employees working to construct and operate LNG facilities. A second example is a service agreement between a proponent and a local government outlining the terms of use of local water for a work camp and facility.

Appendix D – Overview of BC’s regulatory framework for emergency response

Emergency management is a continuous and integrated process involving the efforts of individuals, private sector, local, provincial and federal governments to identify threats, determine vulnerabilities and establish required resources to be able to respond effectively to an emergency.

In B.C., local authorities including municipalities and regional districts are responsible for planning and responding to emergencies within their jurisdictional areas. Emergency Management British Columbia (EMBC) provides leadership in emergency management on behalf of the Province. EMBC works directly with local governments, provincial ministries, other jurisdictions and volunteers in a coordinated effort to prepare for, respond to and recover from emergencies.

A local authority is responsible for the population within its jurisdiction, which could include industrial work camps. Under the *Emergency Program Act* (the Act), a local authority is required to have local emergency plans respecting preparation for, response to and recovery from emergencies and disasters. The Act also requires a local authority to establish and maintain an emergency management organization to develop and implement emergency plans and other preparedness, response and recovery measures.

Workplaces, including industrial work camps to the extent they are workplaces in which workers such as cooks, maintenance people and others work, must comply with the BC Occupational Health and Safety Regulation 296/97 which requires, under Part 3, employers to develop and implement written rescue and evacuation procedures for any workplace in which a need to rescue or evacuate workers may arise. In addition, if and when the new Ministry of Health proposed Work Camps Regulation is adopted, work camps will be required to describe the emergency procedures the camp has in place to deal with medical, health hygiene, natural disasters, facility emergencies, resident related emergencies, and water treatment and sewage disposal failures.

Furthermore, the BC Fire Code requires a fire safety plan for occupancies classified as assemblies, care, treatment or detention; every structure required by the BC Building Code to have a fire alarm system; demolition or construction sites; indoor and outdoor storage areas; areas where flammable liquids and combustible liquids are stored or handled; and areas where hazardous processes or operations occur.

Appendix E – Overview of B.C.’s regulatory framework for industrial work camps

This appendix provides an overview of the regulatory framework for work camps, starting with the BC Oil and Gas Commission (OGC), which regulates, through permits and licenses, oil and gas activities including LNG facilities and pipelines. With respect to work camps, the OGC’s regulatory role is limited to approving access to Crown land for camps, for example, pipeline work camps. No OGC permit is required for work camps on private land.

Local government bylaws and provincial legislation both have a role in regulating industrial work camps. The *Local Government Act* (LGA) and *Community Charter* (CC) provide local governments with the authority to regulate land use planning and development, specifically to adopt bylaws such as Official Community Plan (OCP), zoning and subdivision servicing bylaws. Local governments have legislative authority for zoning private land and some authority for managing land use that occurs on Crown land.

Many industrial work camps are and will be located on Crown land. The applicability of local government bylaws on Crown land is guided by the *Interpretation Act*. Section 14(2) of the *Interpretation Act* provides that an enactment (which includes a local government bylaw) may not affect the Crown in the use or development of Crown land. This means that local government OCP and zoning bylaws cannot affect the Crown’s use of land. However, other local government bylaws that are not concerned with the regulation of land could apply (e.g. speed limits on local streets).

The provisions of section 14(2) of the *Interpretation Act* do not extend to tenants of the Crown. This means that local governments can enact bylaws regulating the use of the land by the tenants of the crown. For example, local governments may enact bylaws for uses such as recreation fishing lodges, ski operations, and forestry or mining camps.

In addition to the OGC and local government regulatory authority, there is a range of Provincial ministries and Acts involved in regulating industrial work camps (see Table 1 below for more information) including:

- *Public Health Act (Industrial Camps Regulation, Sewerage System Regulation)* – siting, floor space requirements, sewage management
- *Drinking Water Protection Act* – drinking water (human consumption, sanitation or food preparation)
- *Workers Compensation Act* – camps with cooks, maintenance people, etc.
- *Environmental Management Act* – waste, sewerage regulations, burning, hazardous waste
- *Water Act* – surface source water supply, water diversion and licenses
- *Fire Services Act* – fuel storage
- *Forest and Range Practices Act* – burning piles, road usage, right to occupy land
- *Agricultural Land Commission Act* – non-farm use in the ALR
- *Industrial Roads Act, Transportation Act* – highway access, permits, road construction approvals
- *Land Act* – approve lease or Crown Grant Land of required land.

From time to time questions arise about which legislative authority takes precedence over another, including questions about the relationship of local government bylaws and provincial legislation.

At time of writing, staff is not aware of situations where local government bylaws regulating industrial work camps have been overridden by provincial legislation. There are cases where local government land use bylaws regulating uses or structures other than industrial work camps have been recognized as not having effect because of provincial legislation. Courts have ruled that zoning powers under the LGA

cannot be used to prohibit the extraction of aggregate on Crown or private land – because this is not a “use” of the land but an extraction of a resource. Provisions of the *Private Managed Forest Land Act* (PMFLA s. 21) restrict local governments’ authority to adopt bylaws or issue certain permits on private managed forest land. Local governments are restricted in their ability to regulate development given that the Private Managed Forest Land Regulation permits one dwelling per registered parcel.

A legal review of the *Oil and Gas Activities Act* (OGAA) and *Public Health Act* (PHA) did not reveal any sections that provide an override of local government bylaws. A local government bylaw is subordinate legislation to either one of these acts. Therefore, if there is a conflict between a local government bylaw and a section of one of these acts, the provincial law would supersede the bylaw. If a person is able to comply with both the provincial law and the local government bylaw, section 10 of the *Community Charter* provides that the bylaw will not be found to be inconsistent with the provincial law. This is known as the “impossibility of dual compliance” test – if a person cannot comply with both the bylaw and the provincial law, then the bylaw will be found to be of no effect.

A thorough review of all B.C. legislation to determine whether there are other acts or regulations that might apply to work camps and provide an override of local government bylaws has not been undertaken to date,^{s.13}

s.13

Table 1: Acts and Regulations and Enforcement Responsibility

	Act and Regulation	Enforcement Responsibility
1	<i>Public Health Act</i> – Industrial Camps Regulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Siting and size of camps • Water supply • Sanitation • Waste management • Sleeping quarters 	Ministry of Health, Health Protection Branch, Northern Health Authority, Environment Health Office
2	<i>Drinking Water Protection Act</i> and Regulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifies requirements for drinking water intended for human consumption, food preparation or sanitation. 	Ministry of Health, Health Protection Branch, Northern Health Authority, Environmental Health Office, Drinking Water Protection Officer
3	<i>Public Health Act</i> – Sewage Disposal Regulation (Sewerage System Regulation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For camps < 100 persons where treat effluent is to be discharged into the ground through absorption fields or seepage pits 	Ministry of Health, Health Protection Branch, Northern Health Authority, Environmental Health Office
4	<i>Workers Compensation Act</i> – Occupation Health and Safety Regulation, Part 25 Camps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies to camps which have workers such as cooks, maintenance people, etc. 	WorkSafeBC
5	<i>Environment Management Act</i> Waste (Refuse) must be disposed of by incineration in an approved incinerator and/or transported to a municipal landfill(a landfill permit may be issued in instances where travel to a landfill is impractical).	Ministry of Environment, Regional Environmental Protection Office, Regional Waste Manager Recycling - Recycling Council of BC
6	<i>Environment Management Act</i> – Municipal	Ministry of Environment, Environment Protection Office

	Act and Regulation	Enforcement Responsibility
	<p>Sewerage Regulation (MSR)</p> <p>Applies to camps of less than 100 persons; and more than 100 persons and treated sewage is to be discharged onto the land surface. At least 90 days before establishing the camp, applicants must provide the MoE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site plan • Design of sewage facility (by a qualified professional) • Operating Plan • Environmental Impact Study 	
7	<i>Environment Management Act</i> – Open Burning Smoke Control Regulation	Ministry of Environment, Environment Protection Office
8	<p><i>Water Act</i></p> <p>If water for camp operation is taken away from any surface source other than a well a licence for long term operations or approval for operations up to 12 months is required</p>	Ministry of Environment, Regional Water Management Branch, Northern Health
9	<p><i>Environmental Management Act</i> – Hazardous Waste Regulation (and Guide)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pertains to the generation storage, transport and disposal of hazardous wastes. 	Ministry of Environment, Regional Environmental Protection Office
10	<p><i>Fire Services Act</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel storage facilities 	BC Fire Commission
11	<p><i>Environmental Management Act</i> – Hazardous Waste Regulation (and Guide) and Spill Reporting Regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spill reporting of petroleum products and other materials 	Ministry of Environment, Regional Environmental Protection Office, Provincial Emergency Program
12	<p><i>Agricultural Land Commission Act</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-farm use in the ALR 	<p>Agricultural Land Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 26 of the ALC Act delegation of powers under S. 25(1) and (2) – Oil and Gas Commission.
13	<i>Oil and Gas Commission Act, Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, Pipeline Act</i>	<p>Oil and Gas Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for regulating oil and gas activities and pipelines • One window review and approval process • ALC Delegation Agreement (NE only)
14	<i>Electrical Safety Act</i>	BC Safety Authority
15	<p><i>Public Health Act</i> - Food Premises Regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies to a place where food intended for public consumption is sold, offered for sale, supplied, handled, prepared, packaged, etc. 	Ministry of Health, Health Protection Branch, Northern Health Authority, Environmental Health Office
16	<i>Forest Act, Forest and Range Practices Act, Environment and Land Use Act, Land Act, Land Titles Act</i>	<p>Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegation agreement in place with the Oil and Gas Commission for some tenures, road use and road access agreements

	Act and Regulation	Enforcement Responsibility
17	Wastewater Systems Effluent Regulations (WSER) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities which collect more than 100 cubic metres 	Environment Canada
18	<i>Industrial Roads Act/Transportation Act</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway access, permits, road construction approvals, etc. 	Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
19	<i>BC Environmental Assessment Act</i>	Environmental Assessment Office (EAO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manages the environmental assessment process for projects that trigger an assessment under the Act.
20	<i>Local Government Act</i>	Local Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bylaw amendments (Land use, OCP)
<i>Primary Source: Policy, Communications, Capacity: A Time to Lead (PRRD) Document</i>		

Appendix F – Overview of LNG facilities and pipelines

Table 2: Facilities work camp overview

	Facility	Location	Workers (construction)	Duration (construction)	Workers (operations)
EA Certificate Issued					
1	Pacific NorthWest LNG	Lelu Island, Port Edward, Prince Rupert Port Authority	3,500 - 4,500	2015 - 2018	unknown
Under EA Review					
2	LNG Canada	District of Kitimat (private lands)	4,500 - 7,500 (3,470 yearly av.)	5 - 10 years	350 - 450 (trains 1 & 2) 450 - 800 (full build-out)
3	Woodfibre LNG	District of Squamish (private lands)	600 person-years	2 years	100 (+ unknown # of contracted staff)
Pre-Application					
4	Aurora LNG	Digby Island, 3km SW of Prince Rupert, SQCRD	4,000 - 5,000	2017-2022	400
5	Grassy Point LNG	30km N of Prince Rupert at Grassy Point, SQCRD (Crown land)	1,000 - 6,000	2017 - 2021	unknown
6	Prince Rupert LNG	Ridley Island, BC, 17 km from Prince Rupert and 15 km from Port Edward	2,000 – 3,850 (in camps); 400 in Prince Rupert	2016 – 2021/24+	unknown
7	WCC LNG	Tuck Inlet, in Prince Rupert	unknown	2017 – 2024 (first phase) 2025 – 2030 (other phases)	unknown

Table 3: Pipelines work camp overview

	Pipeline	Location & Length	Duration (construction)	LGs Affected (within 100km)	Workers & Camps
EA Certificate Issued					
1	Prince Rupert Gas Transmission (PRGT)	Start: Hudsons Hope End: Port Edward (PNW LNG) Length: 900 km	Duration: 18-42 months Start date: 2016	21 local governments	Early work : 400 people Pipeline construction: 9 main camps: 1100 beds each 3 compressor station camps: 150 beds each
2	Coastal Gaslink Pipeline (CGL)	Start: Chetwynd/ Dawson Creek	Duration: 4-24 months Start date:	19 local governments	Pioneer work: 15 camps: 20-200 workers Clearing, construction:

		(Ground Birch) End: Kitimat Length: 650km	Early 2016		10 main camps: 200 - 1,500 workers
3	Westcoast Connector Gas Transmission Pipeline	Start: 100 km NW Fort St. John End: Ridley Island, Prince Rupert (Prince Rupert LNG) Length: 860 km (dual line)	Start date: Late 2016	36 local governments	Pipe construction: 13 main camps Preparation: smaller camps Temporary work camps: at 5 compressor sites
4	Pacific Trail Pipeline (PTP)	Start: Summit Lake (N of Prince George) End: Kitimat (Kitimat LNG) Length: 470 km	Start date: unknown	10 local governments	unknown

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
BRIEFING NOTE FOR MINISTER

Ref #:159157

FOR INFORMATION

Date: August 20, 2015

Title: Proposed Work Camps Regulation

Issue: The Ministry of Health (MOH) Work Camps Regulation ensures receipt of information by health authorities about work camp locations and operations. This information is useful and of interest to local governments, especially those impacted by LNG pipeline and facilities projects.

Background:

The Work Camps Regulation (WCR), once adopted, will replace the existing Industrial Camps Regulation under the *Public Health Act*. The WCR reflects current requirements under the *Public Health Act* related to sewage, drinking water, food safety, accommodation requirements and solid waste management in work camps. In preparing the WCR, MOH consulted over a three-year period with industry stakeholders (e.g. oil and gas, forestry, mining, agriculture, camp service providers), local governments, health authorities and government ministries, including MCSCD.

s.12,s.13,s.14

Mandate Considerations: Minister has a mandate to help ensure communities facing growth due to LNG development are provided support to manage and mitigate the impacts of significant economic development and population growth (which includes impacts of LNG-related work camps).	Liquefied Natural Gas Considerations: Work camps will accommodate temporary work forces involved in the construction of LNG pipeline and facilities projects.
Fiscal Considerations: N/A	First Nations Considerations: N/A

Discussion:

s.12,s.13,s.14

s.12,s.13,s.14

s.12,s.13,s.14

The Regulation will be supported by detailed operating guidelines and report templates that will assist camp operators and health authorities in interpreting the requirements of the Regulation.

s.12,s.13,s.14

Contact: Meggin Messenger
Jennifer Hill
Telephone: 250-387-4045
250-387-0089

<https://icw.eapprovals.cscd.gov.bc.ca/Documents/159157/159157 DRAFT BN MOH Work Camp Regulation August 2015.docx> \ Cliff #
Last update:17/09/2015 - Hill, Jennifer CSCD:EX

Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
BRIEFING NOTE FOR MINISTER

Ref #:164755

FOR INFORMATION

Date: October 2, 2015

Title: Kitimat Manufacturing Zone Amendment Bylaw (bylaw 1841)

Issue: The District Municipality of Kitimat has adopted a new density-bonus zoning bylaw requiring amenity contributions for large new work camps. Chevron Canada opposes the bylaw.

Background: Following extensive public consultation, on July 20, 2015 Kitimat adopted zoning bylaw 1841 that requires a \$500 per bed unit (or in kind) contribution for new work camps. Along with this, work camps larger than 3000 units must have self-contained sewer treatment or provide for necessary upgrades if connected to the municipal system. Smaller work camps (less than 26 units) are exempted.

The purpose behind the bylaw is to raise funds, or in kind contributions, for affordable housing and to address sewage treatment. The legal basis is provided under Part 26 of the *Local Government Act* (LGA) which enables local governments to establish conditions for rezoning and development approvals.

The District held 8 public hearing meetings over several months to discuss the bylaw and Council received input from several stakeholders including Chevron. The bylaw was amended to provide greater flexibility for proponents to support a broader range of housing solutions including in kind contributions in lieu of cash. Specific changes were made in response to comments from LNG Canada and the development of the Housing Action Plan, resulting in LNG Canada's support for the bylaw. Kitimat drafted the bylaw with advice from legal counsel.

In 2014, the Northern Development Initiative Trust, the Ministries of Community Sport and Cultural Development, Natural Gas Development (Office of Construction Standards), BC Housing and local governments (Kitimat, Terrace, Prince Rupert, and Port Edward) partnered to develop *Housing Action Plans* for each community. The plans each include a needs assessment, gap analysis and recommendations for addressing housing affordability. They provide appropriate context for local governments to address housing issues being raised associated with large scale industrial development.

Mandate Considerations: as per note
Liquefied Natural Gas Considerations: as per note
Fiscal Considerations: N/A
First Nations Considerations: as per note
Communications: ^{s.13}

Discussion: The Chevron LNG plant in Kitimat is proposed to be constructed on Indian Reserve Lands and the municipality will not receive taxation for the project. Municipal revenues to cover required municipal services could, in part, be generated from lands with work camps. Chevron believes that during consultation, their concerns were not heard and that the bylaw creates unreasonable new costs.

Kitimat has acted within its authority in adopting bylaw 1841. In drafting the bylaw the municipality worked collaboratively with many stakeholders, and provincial staff, to ensure flexibility for determining an appropriate contribution from proponents seeking to build large work camps. Other industrial stakeholders are working collaboratively with Council under the bylaw. For instance, LNG Canada has committed to deliver initiatives under the *Kitimat Housing Action Plan* in lieu of per-bed payments. This option is available to Chevron.

s.13,s.16

Under section 874 of the LGA, the Minister may alter a local government zoning bylaw if the Minister believes it is contrary to the public interest. This action can be taken after the local government has been provided with notice and has had the time and opportunity to alter the bylaw. ^{s.13}

s.13

Another tool is the *Significant Projects Streamlining Act (SPSA)* which can be utilized by any Minister. It enables Cabinet to designate a project in the public interest as a “provincially significant project.” This then allows for the time and process to manage the local government aspects of the project with the local government. If agreement is not reached during the process, Cabinet and the Minister have the power to override local government. ^{s.13}

s.13,s.16

Contact: Meggin Messenger, Executive Director (IRPB) or Nichola Wade, Executive Director (NWCR)
Telephone: (250) 387-4045

I:\Gov_Relations_Plan_Div\BYLAW APPROVALS AND REFERRALS\BN Kitimat Manufacturing Zone Amendment Bylaw 1841 DRAFT nw.docx
Last update:02/10/2015 -

From: [Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX](#)
To: [Thompson, Laurel CSCD:EX](#)
Subject: FW: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:08:54 PM

Laurel, just a heads up that this may come through you.

From: Faganello, Tara CSCD:EX
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:07 PM
To: Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX
Subject: RE: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting

Thanks, they may come thru Laurel....

From: Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:48 PM
To: Faganello, Tara CSCD:EX
Subject: FW: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting

FYI.

From: Nikolejsin, Dave MNGD:EX
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:47 PM
To: Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX
Subject: RE: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting

Not till Friday

From: Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:22 PM
To: Nikolejsin, Dave MNGD:EX
Subject: RE: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting

Hello Dave, just wondering if there will be any material for this meeting.

Thank you.

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Nikolejsin, Dave MNGD:EX
Sent: Wednesday, March 8, 2017 3:21 PM
To: Nikolejsin, Dave MNGD:EX; Wanamaker, Lori MCF:EX; Sieben, Mark PSSG:EX; Baskerville, Shannon JTST:EX; Brown, Stephen R HLTH:EX; McKnight, Elaine L MEM:EX; Coley, Simon J JAG:EX; Paton, Arlene HLTH:EX; Boyle, Patricia J PSSG:EX; Dawes, Jacquie CSCD:EX; Jardine, Kevin EAO:EX; Caul, Doug D ABR:EX; Hughes, Trevor LBR:EX; Nash, Laurel ABR:EX; Jeakins, Paul OGC:IN; Bailey, Scott EAO:EX; Paulson, Ken OGC:IN; Faganello, Tara CSCD:EX; Humber, Emmy MNGD:EX
Subject: Construction Camps Report Implementation: DM Meeting
When: Monday, March 27, 2017 3:00 PM-4:30 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).
Where: 1810 Blanshard Boardroom 8036

Lake Babine Nation and Nak'azdli First Nations Whuten have undertaken extensive work to

examine the social impacts of constructing and operating industrial camps on nearby Indigenous communities. This work is described in The Firelight Group's report entitled "Indigenous Communities and Industrial Camps: Promoting Healthy Communities in Settings of Industrial Change". The report, funded by MARR and championed by MNGD, provides recommended actions for Indigenous leaders, provincial and federal governments, and industry.

As you may recall, last summer a cross-government working group was convened to provide input to Firelight as they developed the report, with a senior staff member appointed from each of your ministries. BC has committed to ongoing review of the report recommendations and developing appropriate implementation actions for some recommendations with Lake Babine and Nak'azdli. MARR and MNGD have been working to develop a cross-ministry strategy that includes a work plan for engaging First Nations, local governments and the federal government. We would like to meet to solicit your input as we initiate the implementation phase of this initiative.

From: [Faganello, Tara CSCD:EX](#)
To: [Burleson, Ron CSCD:EX](#)
Cc: [Andrade, Ana CSCD:EX](#); [Thompson, Laurel CSCD:EX](#)
Subject: RE: Indigenous Communities and Industrial Camps
Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 4:34:52 PM

Yes I'm attending the meeting on Monday for Jacquie. No materials received for it yet. If there is anything else you think I should know, please forward...

T

From: Burleson, Ron CSCD:EX
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2017 3:21 PM
To: Faganello, Tara CSCD:EX
Subject: Indigenous Communities and Industrial Camps

Tara,

I just had a call with MARR (May Mah-Paulson). This was a follow-up to an item at the last ADM's Committee on NW Community Readiness, where Gio (representing Laurel Nash) mentioned the work the Firelight Group did with the Lake Babine Nation and Nak'azli Whut'en on Industrial Camps and Indigenous Communities.

A few quick points:

- There is a DMs meeting on this on Monday March 27 at 3 pm (1810 Blanshard). First I've heard of it. May M-P thought you may have been invited based on your previous participation on the topic, but you may want to make Jacquie aware. Dave Nickolejsin is leading.
- Laurel Nash was seeking a lead from relevant ministries. Based on the discussion at the ADM Committee (NW Comm Readiness), I have identified myself as that person.
- There will be some planning going in the next while with a plan for broader response to the report's recommendations in the Fall. I have not yet read the full report but review and think about what role we should play going forward. ^{s.13}

s.13

May M-P will forward some of the previously sent background information so I have a complete set. Please advise if there is any additional information you would like. I have the whole report as well if you would like me to print off a copy.

Ron

Ron Burleson, M.A., PMP

Executive Director,
Negotiations and Corporate Initiatives
Local Government Division
Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development
6th Floor, 800 Johnson Street
Victoria 778.698-3328
Terrace 250.638-6512
Mobile 250.208-3981

From: [Harris, Megan A GCPE:EX](#)
To: [Dick, Joan L CSCD:EX](#); [Sandur, Parveen CSCD:EX](#)
Cc: [Pavlich, Alexis GCPE:EX](#); [Mukasa, Kate GCPE:EX](#)
Subject: FW: Final drafts: Amnesty International report on impacts of resource development on Indigenous communities in North East
Date: Thursday, November 3, 2016 8:37:09 AM
Attachments: [KM_SEEMP_draft.docx](#)

Good morning Joan,

Late yesterday Alexis and I were alerted to the below report coming out this morning and CSCD was unfortunately missed on the list. We received a heads up a while back that a new report would be coming out but no specific details on timing or what would be needed from us in response. We started working with program last night and have the meat and bones around SEEMPs in the NW pulled together. This report is specific to the NE so SEEMPs are not directly related however highly relevant.

Since it is LNG, Alexis is now going to take the lead on this and will be cleaning up the KMs we pulled together (high level draft attached for FYI only and not review). She will have something over to you as soon as approvals go through program again. Unfortunately timing is VERY tight and the original timing for a media avail was 10am... Lisa Leslie in MARR has told us we have some time since they are still waiting on two other ministries as well.

Please give me a call if you need further details otherwise you will see something shortly.

Cheers,
Megan

From: Woolley, Paul GCPE:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2016 5:11 PM
To: Pavlich, Alexis GCPE:EX
Subject: FW: Final drafts: Amnesty International report on impacts of resource development on Indigenous communities in North East

From: Leslie, Lisa GCPE:EX
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Crebo, David GCPE:EX; Murphy, Bernadette GCPE:EX; Woolley, Paul GCPE:EX; Ash, Christine GCPE:EX; Thomas, Vivian P GCPE:EX; Dean, Sharon GCPE:EX; Plank, Sarah GCPE:EX; Thistle-Walker, Carlene GCPE:EX; Kuzminski, Jason GCPE:EX; Nelson, Tiffany GCPE:EX; McAndrews, Caroline GCPE:EX; Ustina, Barb GCPE:EX; Lauvaas, Kirsten GCPE:EX; Johnston, Karen GCPE:EX; Anderson, Erin GCPE:EX; McRae, Meghan GCPE:EX; Anderson, Kristy GCPE:EX; Cascaden, Lori R GCPE:EX; Vinette, Nicole EAO:EX; Haslam, David GCPE:EX; Gilmore, Dan GCPE:EX; Plummer, Glen GCPE:EX
Cc: Gordon, Matt GCPE:EX; Wolford, Jessica GCPE:EX; Ritchie, Leanne GCPE:EX; Pocock, Sharon GCPE:EX; Hill, Edward GCPE:EX
Subject: Final drafts: Amnesty International report on impacts of resource development on Indigenous communities in North East

Hi folks,

Attached are our final draft materials re the Amnesty report on resource development in the northeast and impacts on Indigenous communities. Thank you for all content provided.

- Key Messages
- Recommendation by Recommendation response document
- Media Plan – advise if any objections to approach and govt leads
- Key Messages from EAO
- BC Hydro statement
- Amnesty media advisory
- The report

Links to other relevant online resources

- Backgrounders on BC Hydro community mitigation measures in first year of Site C construction https://news.gov.bc.ca/files/MEM-Site_C_Backgrounders.pdf
- BC Hydro information sheet on regional and community benefits <https://www.bchydro.com/content/dam/BCHydro/customer-portal/documents/corporate/media/site-c-info-sheet-regional-and-community-benefits-feb-2016.pdf>
- BC Hydro information sheet on Aboriginal consultation and engagement https://www.sitecproject.com/sites/default/files/Aboriginal%20Engagement%20-%20December%202015_0.pdf

Roll out

- Nov. 3, 2016 - Media avail and report release at 10.00 am, UBC Robson Square, the Sunroom, 800 Robson St, Vancouver
- Nov. 4, 2016 – Panel discussion at North Peace Cultural Centre, Fort St John (expected participants: frontline service providers, community activists, people impacted by violence and public officials to discuss issues raised in the report with each other and with audience members. The acting mayor of Fort St John may also attend. Other specific participants not yet known.)
Note: The panel is sponsored by the Alaska Highway News.
- Sustained Amnesty e-campaign
- Follow-up reports from Amnesty on impacts and progress – timing TBD

KEY MESSAGES

Socio-Economic Effects Management Plans

- Natural resource development benefits B.C. communities significantly.
- LNG projects have the potential to bring unprecedented investment dollars to communities.
- Some major LNG projects involve substantial temporary construction workforces that can be located close to communities.
- As a result, local governments are concerned that the communities they represent will be unable to accommodate new economic developments.
- There are two key challenges:
- First, a community needs a way to ensure that infrastructure and services in communities are not compromised for residents as a result of this new development and the influx of a substantial but temporary workforce.
- Second, a community needs to be able to provide infrastructure and services to meet the demands of new industrial and development projects.
- As part of the Community Readiness Initiative, the Province has been working with communities on a range of initiatives and customized approaches to support communities in meeting the challenges of major LNG development.
- A key provincial action to help meet these challenges was to establish Socio-Economic Effects Management Plans – or SEEMPs.
- The purpose of these plans is to manage the direct adverse effects on community-level infrastructure and services as a result of project construction and the temporary workforces.
- The key benefit provided by these plans is that they foster early and ongoing information sharing and a process to ensure the adverse impacts on communities are effectively managed.
- And – they create an opportunity for relationship building and co-ordinated responses between the local governments, provincial infrastructure and service providers, Aboriginal groups and LNG developers.

- The Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development’s role is to provide advice and problem-solve as SEEMPs are developed and implemented.
- SEEMPS complement other work being undertaken by the Government of B.C., as part of the Community Readiness Initiative.

Industrial Work Camps

- We understand many local governments in B.C.’s north deal with the reality of industrial work camps for people employed at natural resource development sites in remote areas.
- The Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development is supporting better coordination of information so that roles and responsibilities are clarified, impacts are understood and so that co-ordinated solutions can be found.
- Every community and every project is different. We strive for customized solutions for local communities.
- We will continue to recognize the role of partnerships in achieving practical solutions that address the concerns of local governments to ensure that important economic activities can move forward successfully.

.....

BACKGROUND

The SEEMP process is unique because:

- It is an innovative new process for directly connecting industry with local governments.
- It formalized a structure through a regulatory mechanism for improved communication between all levels of government, industry and stakeholders.
- It produced an improved inter-provincial ministry relationship for LNG projects.
- It improved Provincial support of local governments facing large industry impacts.
- It created a greater awareness from Certificate Holders to look at their practices of adverse effect mitigation (e.g. strengthen of work camp policies) in coordination with community-level infrastructure and service providers.
- It has gained support from community-level infrastructure and service providers and Certificate Holders for creating a formalized approach for engagement and information

SEEMPs for Community-level Infrastructure and Services for Liquefied Natural Gas projects brings together LNG proponents, provincial government ministries, community-level infrastructure and services providers and Aboriginal groups to ensure that adverse effects from LNG projects are managed.

SEEMPs have created a framework of collaboration and information sharing and has improved dialogue between industry and community. British Columbia has a robust framework for managing the effect of development on populations and the land base.

s.13

Many of the communities that are affected are struggling to manage their own sustainable growth after recent economic downturns and recognize that they do not have the needed infrastructure or capacity to adequately manage the effects.

From: Rhodes, Gillian GCPE-EX
To: Dick, Joan L CSCD-EX
Cc: O'Brien, Kellie CSCD-EX; Whitelock, Riley CSCD-EX; Bates Gibbs, Bonnie GCPE-EX; Dawes, Jacquie CSCD-EX; Faganello, Tara CSCD-EX; Schneider, Vanessa GCPE-EX; Woods, Emily GCPE-EX; Gordon, Matt GCPE-EX
Subject: key messages: Work Camps
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2015 3:52:19 PM
Attachments: KM_Workcamps_Prtinhar 2015.docx
Peace River RD 1 and 5.docx

Joan,

To follow up on the Peace River Regional District meeting at UBCM – and their request for regulating work camps, we've put together key messages for the Minister's back pocket – see attached.

This is in response to the clip: [Regional District proposes worker camp tax - Mike Carter - Alaska Highway News - October 19, 2015 08:33 AM](#)

Regarding the allocation that "the Province has yet to follow through" – S.13

S.13

The PRRD requested the province create a single approval office for all industries that allowed for comment from any "agency, regulator or local government" that has an interest in the "location, operation, safety, health, and socio-economic impacts associated with the camp" before one is approved.

The motion was endorsed by the UBCM. S.13

In its response, the Ministry of Community, Sport, and Cultural Development said the issue of work camps doesn't necessarily stem from a gap in regulatory framework, but rather "the need for improved communication and co-ordination between local governments, proponents and regulatory (bodies)," so that responsibilities are clearly defined.

The government also pointed to its "leadership role" in establishing a socio-economic effects management plan as an environmental assessment condition.

"The intent of the (the plan) is to ensure a clear and defined role for an environmental assessment certificate holder, identifying and mitigating socio-economic effects on community-level services and infrastructure arising from the construction of the certificate holders project," the government said.

The province adds this model could guarantee "a clear and collaborative process to jointly identifying and mitigating effects with proponents and impacted communities."

Key Messages

Industrial Work Camps

October 20, 2015

- Economic development does bring challenges to communities – but these are better challenges to face than those imposed by economic stagnation.
- I know many local governments in B.C.'s north deal with the reality of industrial work camps for people employed at natural resource development sites in remote areas.
- My Ministry is supporting better coordination of information so that roles and responsibilities are clarified, impacts are understood and so that co-ordinated solutions can be found.
- Every community and every project is different. We will strive for customized solutions for local communities.
- We will continue to recognize the role of partnerships in achieving practical solutions that address the concerns of local governments to ensure that important economic activities can move forward successfully.

2015 UBCM CONVENTION – Minister’s Briefing Note

Minister’s Meeting with the Peace River Regional District

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ASSISTANT DEPUTY MINISTER’S OFFICE – LOCAL GOVERNMENT DIVISION

Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2015

Time: 4:25 PM – 4:40 PM

ISSUE: s.13

s.13

s.12,s.13,s.14

s.13

- The Peace River Agreement (Agreement) which has provided more than \$302 million to the region since 2005 is the primary provincial response to support the Northeast to address services and infrastructure demands resulting from resource development. s.13
s.13

- Further, as with local governments province-wide, communities in the Northeast have access to conventional taxation and infrastructure funding approaches (e.g. finance tools, property taxes, user fees, development cost charges and senior government grants and funding programs). As well, some proponents are entering into independent agreements with communities, service providers and First Nations to mitigate potential effects and provide benefits.

RECOMMENDED COMMENTS:

- I appreciate you taking the time to raise the important issue of resource development industry in the Northeast and the impact on local governments. CSCD recognizes that industrial work camps present complex challenges to local governments as they are varied in size, scale, type, location, and impact.
- The Province is committed to supporting communities to prepare for the growth and economic opportunity arising from natural gas development and other major resource development.
- Different regions have different characteristics, opportunities and challenges so approaches need to be tailored to differing circumstances.
- With this in mind, in the Northeast there are a range of initiatives in place designed to help local governments manage the impacts of resource development, including work camps.
- Most notably, building on more than \$302 million in funding since 2005 under the old MOU, the new Peace River Agreement will provide more than \$50 million to the region every year going forward - over \$1 billion over 20 years. This includes \$1 million in 2015 to support the work of the Agreement to collaborate on areas of shared interest - which could include research, planning and information sharing between communities, the Province and other stakeholders.

s.13

- I would be interested in hearing the PRRD's views on specific gaps and suggestions for addressing any potential gaps it perceives.

Key Contact Person: Meggin Messenger

Phone: 250-387-4045

KEY MESSAGES

Socio-Economic Effects Management Plans

- Natural resource development benefits B.C. communities significantly.
- LNG projects have the potential to bring unprecedented investment dollars to communities.
- Some major LNG projects involve substantial temporary construction workforces that can be located close to communities.
- As a result, local governments are concerned that the communities they represent will be unable to accommodate new economic developments.
- There are two key challenges:
- First, a community needs a way to ensure that infrastructure and services in communities are not compromised for residents as a result of this new development and the influx of a substantial but temporary workforce.
- Second, a community needs to be able to provide infrastructure and services to meet the demands of new industrial and development projects.
- As part of the Community Readiness Initiative, the Province has been working with communities on a range of initiatives and customized approaches to support communities in meeting the challenges of major LNG development.
- A key provincial action to help meet these challenges was to establish Socio-Economic Effects Management Plans – or SEEMPs.
- The purpose of these plans is to manage the direct adverse effects on community-level infrastructure and services as a result of project construction and the temporary workforces.
- The key benefit provided by these plans is that they foster early and ongoing information sharing and a process to ensure the adverse impacts on communities are effectively managed.
- And – they create an opportunity for relationship building and co-ordinated responses between the local governments, provincial infrastructure and service providers, Aboriginal groups and LNG developers.

- The Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development's role is to provide advice and problem-solve as SEEMPs are developed and implemented.
- SEEMPS complement other work being undertaken by the Government of B.C., as part of the Community Readiness Initiative.

Industrial Work Camps

- We understand many local governments in B.C.'s north deal with the reality of industrial work camps for people employed at natural resource development sites in remote areas.
- The Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development is supporting better coordination of information so that roles and responsibilities are clarified, impacts are understood and so that co-ordinated solutions can be found.
- Every community and every project is different. We strive for customized solutions for local communities.
- We will continue to recognize the role of partnerships in achieving practical solutions that address the concerns of local governments to ensure that important economic activities can move forward successfully.

BACKGROUND

The SEEMP process is unique because:

- It is an innovative new process for directly connecting industry with local governments.
- It formalized a structure through a regulatory mechanism for improved communication between all levels of government, industry and stakeholders.
- It produced an improved inter-provincial ministry relationship for LNG projects.
- It improved Provincial support of local governments facing large industry impacts.
- It created a greater awareness from Certificate Holders to look at their practices of adverse effect mitigation (e.g. strengthen of work camp policies) in coordination with community-level infrastructure and service providers.
- It has gained support from community-level infrastructure and service providers and Certificate Holders for creating a formalized approach for engagement and information

SEEMPs for Community-level Infrastructure and Services for Liquefied Natural Gas projects brings together LNG proponents, provincial government ministries, community-level infrastructure and services providers and Aboriginal groups to ensure that adverse effects from LNG projects are managed.

SEEMPs have created a framework of collaboration and information sharing and has improved dialogue between industry and community. British Columbia has a robust framework for managing the effect of development on populations and the land base.

s.13

Many of the communities that are affected are struggling to manage their own sustainable growth after recent economic downturns and recognize that they do not have the needed infrastructure or capacity to adequately manage the effects.