



BRIEFING NOTE FOR DECISION

Date: June 3, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: Commercial Vehicle Licensing (CVL)^{s.13}
Issue: s.13; s.16

RECOMMENDED OPTION:

- s.13

BACKGROUND:

Under the *Local Government Act, (LGA)* the UBCM administers the CVL program, which had 99 participating municipalities in 2018. Commercial vehicles that use municipal roads within a participating municipality must purchase and display a commercial vehicle license decal each year.

CVL fees range from \$25 for vehicles under 2,800 kg, such as taxis, up to \$40 for very large commercial vehicles. For each license sold, municipalities retain \$6.25 in administration fees and remit the remaining balance to UBCM. Revenue collected from the CVL program is then redistributed to participating municipalities to offset costs associated with commercial vehicle use, such as roads maintenance, signage, snow removal and parking control. The proceeds are distributed on a per capita basis, using a formula-controlled set by UBCM. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH) provides UBCM with

s.13

DISCUSSION:

s.13



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.12; s.13; s.16; s.17

OPTIONS:

s.13

Page 003 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.12 ; s.13 ; s.17



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

PREPARED BY:

Stephen Harrison, Senior Policy Analyst
Community Policy and Legislation Branch
(778) 698-9368

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, ADM
Local Government Division
David Curtis, ADM
Community and Management Services

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 28, 2019

May 31, 2019

May 21, 2019



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 9, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable John Horgan, Premier
Title: TransLink Late Night Service
Issue: TransLink has been conducting a study on late night transit for the past year.
Meeting With: Richard Stewart, Mayor of Coquitlam

KEY MESSAGES:

- **We want people to have the transit options they need to get home safely every day of the week.**
- **Extending service hours later on a weekend—or any other time—is a good discussion to have, and I understand TransLink is increasing some of their bus services to meet that demand.**
- **For example, TransLink is expanding their NightBus service to help customers get home safely and making it more convenient to access this service through their NightBus District.**
- **The NightBus District is a well-lit, Transit Security patrolled central hub where you can catch any NightBus after 2 a.m.**

BACKGROUND:

TransLink is often asked why SkyTrain can't run 24/7. This issue was the topic of a CTV feature in 2017 on overnight maintenance. TransLink staff escorted the reporter and camera person on a tour of maintenance facilities and took them out on the tracks overnight to see the work first hand. This piece prompted an editorial in the Georgia Straight suggesting later SkyTrain service would prevent some of the violent behavior in downtown Vancouver's entertainment districts. The idea has been explored by TransLink in the past and TransLink determined the costs outweigh the benefits. In particular:

- Making up maintenance time would be extremely difficult and would impact daytime service;
- It would require construction of new infrastructure; and
- Additional staff would have to be hired and paid.

Currently, on the Expo line, the last trains from Waterfront Station in Vancouver leaves to Surrey at 1:16 a.m. and to Coquitlam at 1:11am. On the Canada Line, the last train leaves for Richmond-Brighouse Station at 1:15 a.m.

DISCUSSION:

In December 2017, TransLink launched a review of late night services, including SkyTrain hours of operation and buses. TransLink has made it clear that any increases to service hours must not come at the expense of vitally-important SkyTrain maintenance requirements. TransLink is working on finalizing a SkyTrain operational impact plan report by summer, 2019 and expect to present their findings to the Mayors' Council in June [CONFIDENTIAL].

TransLink has established a group of key stakeholders, including municipal officials, police, local businesses, industry associations, student groups and transportation-related organizations. The objective



of the stakeholder group is to discuss the full range of impacts and options, including potential alternative means of improving safe transportation out of the downtown core late at night. TransLink staff have noted that a Spring 2019 meeting with this group is expected.

In June 2018, TransLink launched a pilot project to highlight the already available NightBus service. This was part of an effort to address concerns about the lack of late night transportation out of Vancouver's downtown core late at night. Feedback from the public was positive and the NightBus has become a permanent feature. TransLink runs 10 NightBus routes and NightBuses departing from downtown Vancouver run every 30 minutes, 7 days a week. Some of the new service hours funded through the 10-Year Vision have been used to reduce overcrowding on the more popular NightBus routes.

Media

Coquitlam mayor Richard Stewart was recently in the media¹, asking TransLink to find a way to readjust its maintenance schedules to allow trains to run longer hours on Friday and Saturday nights, to ensure people can get home safely after bars and restaurants close. The mayor was also quoted as saying, *"A lot of our residents are clamoring for alternatives. The Province is dragging its heels on ride-hailing, and as a result the taxis just don't cut it, we can't get cabs to the suburbs from downtown Vancouver."* Other stakeholders advocating for extended train hours are Vancouver's BarWatch, an association for safe bars and nightclubs in the city and the Vancouver Business Improvement Association.

PREPARED BY:

Kate Mukasa, Manager
Community Policy and Legislation Branch
(778) 698-9368

APPROVED BY:

David Curtis, Assistant Deputy Minister & EFO
Community and Management Services Division

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 9, 2019

May 9, 2019

¹ Global News, May, 6th, 2019: <https://globalnews.ca/news/5247141/extended-skytrain-hours-coquitlam-mayor/>



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 24, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: City of Victoria
Issue: Discussion of the valuation of short-term rentals (STRs) by BC Assessment (BCA)
Meeting With: Lisa Helps, Mayor, City of Victoria on May 28, 2019

KEY MESSAGES:

s.13; s.16

-
- s.13
- **The Province has taken steps to ensure owners and operators of STRs are paying their fair share of taxes. The Province will continue to work with local governments and BCA to address concerns regarding the assessment and taxation of STRs.**
- **The Province has also raised the allowable fine that strata corporations can charge STR operators who violate strata bylaws to \$1,000 a day, making it a meaningful deterrent.**
- **Local governments can regulate STRs through zoning requirements, bylaws, permitting (e.g., requiring business licences) and inspection.**
- s.13
-
-

BACKGROUND:

In November 2018, the City of Victoria (City) wrote to both Ministers of Municipal Affairs and Housing and Finance (Appendix 1), which indicated that it has implemented a STR regulatory framework in 2018, which allows STRs in both principle residences and non-principle residences: a tiered structure uses high fees to discourage STRs in non-principle residences such as investment properties and second homes. Note that no further details were provided on this framework. In this letter, the City also requested that legislation be amended so that all residential units in multi-unit buildings be eligible to be split-classified between Class 1 (Residential) and Class 6 (Business and Other).

The Minister replied in February 2019 (Attachment 2). As a follow up, the City has requested to meet and discuss STRs in person (Attachment 3).

DISCUSSION:

Currently, many STRs are assessed as Class 1 (Residential) and pay a lower rate of property taxes than hotels and motels, which are assessed as Class 6 (Business and Other).



s.13; s.14; s.16

The Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) endorsed a 2017 resolution from Tofino (B20) requesting a legislative amendment that all residential properties also used for STRs be eligible to be split-classified.

s.13; s.14; s.16

The Province is already taking steps to ensure owners and operators of STRs are paying their fair share of taxes. In addition, the Province passed regulations in July 2018, allowing strata corporations to levy fines of up to \$1,000 a day if strata owners or residents are violating a strata's short-term rental bylaw.

s.13; s.14; s.16

However, the potential STR working group now under discussion with UBCM staff could decide to explore this issue.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

s.13; s.14; s.16

•

•

Attachments (2):

1. City of Victoria Letter on Short Term Rental (November 21, 2018)
2. Minister's Response (February 12, 2019)
3. City of Victoria Meeting Request Letter (April 1, 2019)

PREPARED BY:

Rob Fraser, Executive Director
Property Assessment Services
(778) 698-3560

APPROVED BY:

David Curtis, Assistant Deputy Minister
Community and Management Services Division
Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 23, 2019

May 23, 2019

May 24, 2019



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

ATTACHMENT 1: City of Victoria Letter on Short Term Rental (November 21, 2018)

THE CITY OF VICTORIA



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Honourable Selina Robinson
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
PO Box 9056 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2

MINISTRY OF MUNICIPAL
AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

NOV 30 2018

☐ Min Sg ☐ Reply Direct ☐ FYI / File
☐ DM Advise ☐ DM ☐ ADM

November 21, 2018

Dear Minister Robinson,

On behalf of Victoria City Council, I am writing today to request amendments to the BC Assessment Act on a priority basis to ensure that units used as commercial short-term rentals are taxed as commercial property.

The City of Victoria has one of the lowest rental vacancy rates in the country, at only 0.7%. Addressing housing availability and affordability are top priorities for Victoria City Council, and the City recognizes its important role in supporting the development of solutions to both challenges.

In this regard, the City of Victoria has implemented a short-term rental regulatory framework. While it allows short-term rental in both principal residences and non-principal residences,

s.16

Bold action is needed from all levels of government to tackle the housing crisis. We therefore respectfully request amendments to the BC Assessment Act on a priority basis to provide for split classification and taxation of units in multi-unit buildings, to ensure those being used as commercial short-term rentals (i.e. non-principal residences) are taxed as commercial, rather than residential, property.

Sincerely,

Lisa Helps
Victoria Mayor

Cc. Members of the Legislative Assembly representing constituencies on Vancouver Island

1 Centennial Square Victoria British Columbia Canada V8W 1P6
Telephone (250) 361-0200 Fax (250) 361-0348 Email mayor@victoria.ca
www.victoria.ca



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

ATTACHMENT 2: Minister's Response (February 12, 2019)



February 12, 2019

Ref: 242597

Her Worship Mayor Lisa Helps
City of Victoria
1 Centennial Sq
Victoria BC V8W 1P6

Dear Mayor Helps:

Thank you for your letter of November 21, 2018, regarding Short-Term Rentals (STRs) and property taxation. As staff needed additional time to review your suggestions, an interim reply was sent to your office on December 20, 2018. In addition, as your proposal would affect both assessment classification and property taxes, I have forwarded a copy of your letter to my colleague the Honourable Carole James, Minister of Finance and Deputy Premier.

I understand STRs have a negative impact on long-term affordable rental stock, and I appreciate Victoria's leadership in taking action to address these issues (e.g., developing and implementing an STR regulatory framework).

The issue of STRs is complex and relatively new. I read with interest your proposal to amend the Assessment Act and apply split property classification when assessing STR units (e.g., split classifying a strata unit when a room is rented out on a short-term basis). However, based on the information provided, the City's proposal would have substantial assessment policy, legislative and tax implications on a provincial basis. In addition, implementing such a proposal would be very costly, and it would be time consuming for BC Assessment (BCA) to identify the units to which this policy would apply.

Should the Province of British Columbia decide to review the provisions for split classification under the Assessment Act, your proposal will be taken into consideration. The Province is taking steps to address some of the concerns that have been raised about STRs. The *Strata Property Act* was amended to enable strata corporations, effective November 30, 2018, to fine strata residents up to \$1,000 per day for not complying with a strata bylaw limiting or banning short term rentals. More information on this subject is available on the Province's strata housing website:

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/housing-tenancy/strata-housing/operating-a-strata/bylaws-and-rules/short-term-rental-bylaws>.

-/2

Ministry of Municipal Affairs
and Housing

Office of the Minister

Mailing Address:
PO Box 9056 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9E2
Phone: 250 387-2283
Fax: 250 387-4312

Location:
Room 310
Parliament Buildings
Victoria BC V8V 1X4

<http://www.gov.bc.ca/mah>



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

Her Worship Mayor Lisa Helps
Page 2

Further, local governments have the authority through the *Local Government Act* and the *Community Charter* to regulate STRs through zoning requirements, bylaws, permitting (e.g., requiring business licences) and inspections. Going forward, the Province will continue to work with local governments and BCA to address concerns regarding the assessment and taxation of STRs.

Thank you again for writing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "SR", written over a horizontal line.

Selina Robinson
Minister

pc: Honourable Carole James, Minister of Finance and Deputy Premier



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

ATTACHMENT 3: City of Victoria Meeting Request Letter (April 1, 2019)

THE CITY OF VICTORIA



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Honourable Selina Robinson
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
PO Box 9056 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria, BC V8W 9E2

April 1, 2019

Dear Minister *Selina* Robinson,

On behalf of Victoria City Council and in response to your letter dated February 12, 2019, I am writing today to request a meeting with you to discuss the City and the Province's position on the matter of BC Assessment Authority's valuation of commercial, short term rental units.

My Executive Assistant, Danielle St Jacques, can help to coordinate scheduling for this meeting. She can be reached by phone at 250.361.0597, or by email at DSt.Jacques@victoria.ca.

I look forward to hearing from your office and collaborating further on this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lisa Helps
Victoria Mayor



BRIEFING NOTE FOR DECISION

Date: May 8, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Ridley Island Tax Sharing Formula

Issue: Present options and a recommendation on a possible change to the Ridley Island tax sharing formula (between the City of Prince Rupert and the District of Port Edward).

RECOMMENDED OPTION:

- **OPTION 1:** Amend the Ridley Island funding formula to include two components for Port Edward's annual funding: (1) a fixed payment amount of \$550,000, plus (2) a variable amount equal to 4 percent of tax revenue generated from Ridley Island.

Prince Rupert would keep the remainder of any tax revenue generated from Ridley Island.

This payment formula would be fixed for the next ten- years to ensure funding stability. For the period after that, the Province can include a process for periodically reviewing the formula, including a dispute resolution process if the parties cannot reach consensus on a change.

Develop an implementation plan for this change including communications with UBCM and to the two municipalities as well as the Regional District.

BACKGROUND:

The communities of Prince Rupert and Port Edward are the only two municipalities located on the mainland of the North Coast Regional District. While there have been occasional disagreements in their relations, the two neighbouring communities (less than 10 kilometers apart) have amicably coexisted for more than century. Prince Rupert was incorporated in 1910 and Port Edward founded in 1908 and formally incorporated in 1966. Refer to attachment 2 (Appendix A: map showing the location of Prince Rupert, Port Edward and primary industrial lands).

Prince Rupert is the regional centre and by far the larger of the two communities, with 12,821 residents to Port Edward's 481. Despite long spans of stability, the relations between the two communities have become increasingly acrimonious, with the focus of that conflict being a large industrial property called Ridley Island.

In 1980, the Provincial Government expanded Prince Rupert's boundaries to include Ridley Island (1980-Order in Council (OIC) 0595). This island is the site to two major export terminals: one for grain and the other for coal. Section 3 of the Letters Patent (LP) enacted by this OIC created a tax sharing formula, whereby 80 percent of the municipal tax generated from Ridley Island would go to Prince Rupert and the remaining 20 percent to Port Edward. Section 5 of the LP allows for an adjustment to the formula with the ratification of both councils and approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, without requiring amendment by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

In 1984, both councils and the Minister agreed to increase Prince Rupert's allocation from 80 percent to 83 percent and reduce Port Edward's allocation from 20 percent to 17 percent. This reduction of Port Edward's allocation was in lieu of funding for recreation services provided by Prince Rupert.

There was a subsequent review of the allocation formula in 1989. However, the two parties could not come to a mutual agreement on an amendment. Prince Rupert maintained the formula for revenue sharing was inequitable because their population is much larger than Port Edward's.



Whereas, Port Edward maintains the existing formula is fair because Ridley Island is located far closer to Port Edward's town core, and the rail line servicing the island goes directly through Port Edward.

The situation escalated in 1990, when Prince Rupert withheld a portion of the Ridley Island payment to Port Edward, and Port Edward filed a legal action. This payment disagreement was legally settled in 1991 with Prince Rupert paying Port Edward the full amount under the OIC. After that, the two municipalities civilly agreed-to-disagree on the allocation, and the payment situation stabilized for many years, with Ridley Island generating about \$3.2 million in annual tax revenue, and \$550,000 of that total going to Port Edward.

s.13; s.16; s.17

s.13; s.16; s.17

Page 015 of 136 to/à Page 019 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.16

**RECOMMENDATION:**

OPTION 1: Amend the funding formula to include two components for Port Edward: (1) a fixed payment amount of \$550,000, plus (2) a variable amount equal to 4 percent of tax revenue from Ridley Island; and amend the LP to include a dispute resolution clause.

s.16

s.16

s.16

Page 021 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.16

Page 022 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16 ; s.17

Page 023 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.16



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 15, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: City of Port Moody

Issue: Assigning duties to acting mayors in Port Moody while the mayor is on a leave of absence

Meeting With: Meghan Lahti, Acting Mayor, City of Port Moody on May 16, 2019.

KEY MESSAGES:

- The public should be able to have confidence in their elected officials and I take the issues that your community is facing very seriously. I know that city councils in B.C. have struggled with what steps to take when an elected official has been charged with a serious offence. I appreciate that Port Moody council is actively working to address these challenges.
- A local elected official is not disqualified when charges are laid, as the presumption of innocence is a fundamental tenet of Canadian law. However, local governments have voluntary tools they may use when an elected official is charged with a criminal offence.
- Taking a paid leave of absence, like in the case of your mayor, is an appropriate option.
- I understand that the role of mayor requires a lot of additional work, which may be challenging for councillors who are stepping up to act as mayor. While dividing the responsibilities of the mayor among more than one individual may lessen the work load, local government legislation only contemplates having one acting mayor at a time. I encourage you to seek independent legal advice on this matter.
- Thank you for informing me of your work with the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General regarding municipal police board membership. They are the appropriate people to work with on this matter.
- I will note that there has been interest from local governments, as evidenced by two resolutions at the UBCM Convention in 2018, in amending the *Local Government Act* to develop a response to the recent incidents of local elected officials who have been charged or convicted of serious criminal offences. My staff are actively exploring these sensitive issues and are working towards developing ways to better support local governments in situations like this. This includes the potential for legislative changes.

BACKGROUND:

On March 28, 2019, the Mayor of Port Moody was charged with sexual assault and has taken a paid leave of absence while he focusses on the charges. He is alleged to have committed the assault in 2015 in Coquitlam when he was a Port Moody city councillor. He is currently on a paid leave of absence from Port Moody council, while his criminal case is proceeding through the courts. The council of Port Moody has scheduled a rotation of three acting mayors who will assume the duties and powers of the office until the end of the year.



DISCUSSION:

Local Elected Official on a Leave of Absence

The LGA provides that local elected officials are disqualified from being nominated to, running for, and holding local elected office when **serving a custodial sentence for an indictable offence**. Local elected officials **charged** with criminal offences may continue to hold office, as this does not meet the criteria for disqualification. A fundamental tenet of Canadian law is the presumption of innocence and individuals facing criminal charges have not yet been tried, convicted, or sentenced.

Local governments currently have voluntary tools to address this situation. For example, local governments, like Port Moody, may grant an elected official leave (e.g. permission to be absent from council meetings) while the matter is proceeding through the judicial process. Local governments can do this on a “one off” basis or create policies, such as in their Code of Conduct, establishing the expectation that elected officials will take a paid leave of absence in such circumstances. Paid leave is an appropriate option in light of the presumption of innocence. The local government may determine whether the official will be paid while on leave and for how long. When the mayor is on a leave of absence, the council must designate a member of council to act as mayor, in accordance with the procedure bylaw.

Powers and Duties of Acting Mayors in Port Moody

Port Moody’s procedure bylaw provides that, every year, council must designate councillors to serve as acting mayor on a rotating basis. There are three members of Port Moody council who have been selected to act as mayor for three months each until the end of the year. Given the additional powers and duties associated with the office of mayor (e.g. sitting on the regional district board), Port Moody has been dividing mayoral duties amongst the acting mayors to provide that the work load is not too onerous for one individual.

There are practical and legal challenges with dividing the responsibilities of the mayor among several individuals. The *Community Charter* (the Charter) provides that a city with a population of 50,000 or less is to have a mayor and 6 councillors. The mayor is the head and chief executive officer of the municipality and has additional responsibilities that focus on the mayor’s leadership role. Dividing the functions of this role among several people may lead to uncertainty regarding who is accountable as the mayor. In addition, the mayor also receives a higher level of compensation than councillors and it would be unclear how much additional compensation each acting mayor should receive.

The Charter also provides that a council member may be designated to act in place of the mayor and the acting mayor will have the same powers and duties as the mayor. This provision is based on the assumption that one person will take the role as acting mayor. While the Charter does not expressly prohibit multiple people taking on different aspects of the mayor’s role; it does not contemplate this option. Given the lack of clarity under the Charter, MAH staff could obtain a legal opinion from Legal Services Branch (LSB) of the Ministry of Attorney General for guidance on this matter. Similarly, it may be prudent for Port Moody to obtain independent legal advice of whether their approach is viable.

The Mayor as Chair of the Police Board

The *Police Act* provides that the mayor of the municipality is the chair of the municipal police board. This role requires significant training and additional work. Port Moody is concerned that rotating each acting mayor in this role will be too onerous. The CAO of Port Moody informed MAH staff that the City is working with the Policing and Security Branch at the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General (PSSG) to determine options. These options include having each acting mayor rotate as chair of the police board or appointing one person to be chair while the mayor is on leave.



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.12; s.13; s.16

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- None

PREPARED BY:

Lydia Zucconi, Senior Policy Analyst
Local Government Policy, Research, and Legislation
(778) 698-3468

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 14, 2019

May 15, 2019



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 15, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: *Water Sustainability Act* Permit Process and Development Approval Process Review

Issue: The Canadian Homebuilders' Association of BC has concerns that the regulatory process for the *Water Sustainability Act* is delaying approvals for housing.

Meeting With: Honourable Doug Donaldson; Neil Moody, Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Homebuilders' Association of BC; Alycia Colter, Manager, Government and Public Relations, Canadian Homebuilders' Association of BC; May 16, 2019

KEY MESSAGES:

- **I appreciate hearing about the concerns of the Canadian Homebuilders' Association of BC regarding delays for building approvals caused by the surface water approval process.**
- **As you are aware, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is working with industry stakeholders, including homebuilders, to address concerns about delays in the development approval process.**
- **The Ministry recently completed a six-month multi stakeholder review of the development approvals process. Working group and technical committee members, including members from CHBABC, discussed delays in the development approval process, including permits and approvals issued by provincial ministries.**
- **We will continue to work with the Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development to better understand this issue and the related work they are undertaking.**
- **I am interested in hearing more about when and where delays happen for your members and your thoughts on creating more efficiencies while protecting impacted waterways.**

BACKGROUND:

The Canadian Homebuilders' Association of BC (CHBABC) is raising concerns that the surface water approval process is causing 12- to 18-month delays for building approvals, particularly in Langley and Surrey.

The Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (FLNRORD) issues surface water approvals under section 11 of the *Water Sustainability Act* with the aim of protecting aquatic ecosystems. Builders are required to obtain approvals from FLNRORD where streams are affected before proceeding with development.

In most cases, the season to complete these works is constrained by timing windows related to fish. Across the province the number of applications being received is increasing and backlogs are being created, with the South Coast Region experiencing the most acute increase in demand and resulting backlog. Although surface water approvals are only required where streams are affected, they are part of the broader development approval process in the local government system.

In December 2018, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing initiated the Development Approvals Process Review to provide a range of stakeholders an opportunity to identify challenges and opportunities



in the current local government development approvals processes and suggest ideas to increase their efficiency and effectiveness across the province.

To achieve this, the Ministry convened a working group with diverse representation from across the province to help steer the process. In addition, the Ministry convened four technical committees representing the North, Okanagan and Interior, Lower Mainland and Vancouver Island to receive and consider more specific input. Participants in both the working group and technical committees included local governments, developers, homebuilders, not-for-profit organizations, and academics.

The review considered all stages of the development approval process in the local government system and included discussions on the role of provincial permits and approvals in the development approvals process.

The third and final meeting of the working group occurred on May 3, 2019, although one more working group meeting may be required to address the volume of recommendations. s.13

s.13

DISCUSSION:

The CHBABC executive participated in the Development Approvals Review Working Group, and individual homebuilder members from local chapters across BC participated in the technical committees. Neil Moody, chief executive officer of CHBABC, attended the first working group meetings and Alycia Colter, Manager of Government and Public Relations for CHBABC, attended the second and third meetings.

During working group and technical committee meetings, stakeholders discussed various processes that cause delay for building approvals, including section 11 approvals under the *Water Sustainability Act*. However, this issue was one of over 60 issues raised and working group members did not rate it as one of their top concerns.

While CHBABC has previously raised their concerns about surface water approvals with FLNRORD, they are raising it again jointly with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in light of the broad changes that the Province is considering to the development approval process. CHBABC is particularly concerned that the season to complete work is constrained by timing windows related to fish, and if members miss that window their projects are delayed by a full year.

The Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development is aware of this issue and has undertaken significant business process improvements, additional risk management, and support from other business areas. Despite these measures, demand for surface water approvals and the backlog of decisions that are not completed each season continue to increase.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

None

PREPARED BY:

Carolyn Gisborne, Senior Planning Analyst
Planning and Land Use Management Branch
(250) 419-8583

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 10, 2019

May 15, 2019



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 22, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Chinese Canadian Living Museum

Issue: Establishment of a “Hub-and-Spoke” model consisting of a network of Vancouver and Regional Hubs to recognize Chinese Canadian history and culture

Meeting With: Honourable George Chow, Minister of State for Trade, Ministry of Jobs, Trade and Technology on May 27, 2019

KEY MESSAGES:

- **The Province of British Columbia has partnered with the federal government on the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP) which has a number of funding streams. Under the ICIP, the Community, Culture and Recreation (CCR) Program will support projects that improve citizen’s access to and quality of cultural, recreational and community spaces.**
- **The CCR Program supports capital infrastructure projects. An application could be submitted to a future intake of the program to support elements of the Chinese Canadian Living Museum that have infrastructure components.**
- **The first intake for the CCR Program closed to applications on January 23, 2019 and an application was not received for the project. After initial planning work has been completed to define the scope, scale and feasibility of Phase 1 of the project, staff will be better positioned to provide advice on program eligibility for a future intake (if available) of the CCR Program.**
- **Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing staff are available to answer questions from applicants, whether specific to a project application, a current program inquiry, or a technical issue with a proposed or future project.**

BACKGROUND:

The Chinatown Society of Vancouver is coordinating the discussions around the potential for creating the Chinese Canadian Living Museums. The Living Museum concept proposes to utilize existing facilities and resources where possible. For example, Vancouver has approximately 80 Chinese Canadian organizations located within Chinatown, the Downtown East side, and Strathcona neighbourhood. Many of the organizations have unique artifacts but do not have the expertise to curate and exhibit for the benefit of the public.

There are currently no other Living Museums established in Canada. Preliminary discussions within the Chinese Canadian community organizations have indicated general support for the concept.

The work to establish a Chinese Canadian Museum builds on formal and public apologies for systemic and legislated exclusionary practice made by federal, provincial and municipal governments beginning 2006. The contributions of early Chinese immigrants, and their descendants, have touched every corner of the province. To honour this legacy, including an acknowledgement of the racism, discrimination and hardships faced by the Chinese Canadian pioneers the Province and the City of Vancouver have committed to establishing a Chinese Canadian Museum. In September 2018, the Premier signed an MOU with the Mayor of the City of Vancouver to work together towards the UNESCO designation for Vancouver’s Chinatown.



In December 2018 online public engagement began, and the organization retained Dr. Henry Yu from the University of British Columbia and Dr. Viviane Gosselin from the Museum of Vancouver to undertake a feasibility study and implementation plan. The UBC and Museum of Vancouver analysis recommended a “Hub and Spoke” –style living museum governed by an independent non-profit entity and phased implementation.

The “Hub-and-spoke” model is envisaged to establish a visitor or cultural centre, “hub”, in multiple regions of the province. The “hub” would attract visitors on the basis of the artifacts, exhibitions, programs and other experiences offered. Off-site “spokes” would be representative of the historic sites of BC Chinese history, sites of contemporary activities, and virtual exhibits that reflect sites that no longer exist physically. The initial “hub” is proposed to be in Vancouver.

Spokes would be located throughout the province, tied together with the common museum brand, and offer a shared experience with an emphasis on the local history and culture, and could include:

- sites of historical or contemporary significance (association buildings)
- universities offering courses in BC Chinese history,
- existing institutions and cultural icons (e.g. Dr. Sun Yet-Sen Garden), and
- places that could display travelling exhibitions

In January and February of this year, community meetings were conducted in Vancouver, Kamloops, Nanaimo, Victoria and Richmond, as well as online sessions.

DISCUSSION:

In October 2018, Minister George Chow formed a 22-member working group to provide advice to Government on community consultations and steps required to establish the museum.

The intention is to utilize existing facilities as the anchor points for the Living Museum. The Chinese Cultural Centre Museum, which includes the Chinese Canadian Military Museum, would be considered as visitor centre and starting point. The hub-and-spoke model is proposed to align with the Chinese migration and reflects the broad geographic contributions of Chinese Canadians to the province, the new tourism framework in BC and the upcoming Federal tourism strategy.

This project idea is at an early stage of development. Phased implementation is planned over the next five years to ensure a smooth transition to the new governing board and to enable activation of hubs and spokes in a progressive manner. The primary objectives in Phase 1 of the project are to establish the non-profit entity to govern the new museum and to start the work required to support the Vancouver Chinatown designation efforts. The subsequent phases of the project will be planned and implemented by the non-profit established in Phase 1 and will include activating and building upon the hub and spoke network.

The Chinatown Society of Vancouver had proposed a feasibility study to identify potential Living Museum sites within existing organizations and heritage buildings as well as assessing artifacts, documents and relevant materials that could be consider for curation within the Living Museum concept. Further the work would include estimating capital and operating costs.

s.13

s.13 No related applications were submitted to the intake that closed on January 23, 2019. After the proponent completes the initial feasibility work and the project becomes more defined



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

Ministry staff will be better positioned to provide advice. When the project reaches the stage where sufficient planning work has been accomplished to submit an application, they could do so under a future CCR intake, if one is approved.

Ministry staff in the Local Government Infrastructure and Finance Branch remain available to answer questions about projects at any stage of their development. The existing CCR program materials can provide guidance to the proponents as they develop the projects should they be interested in applying for capital funding at a future date: www.gov.bc.ca/Investing-in-Canada-Infrastructure-Program.

Attachments:

1. s.12; s.13

PREPARED BY:

Madelaine Martin, A/ Director
Local Government Infrastructure and Finance
(778) 698-4748

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 19, 2019

May 22, 2019

Page 032 of 136 to/à Page 042 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.12 ; s.13



BRIEFING NOTE FOR DECISION

Date: May 27, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Facilitation between the Village of Anmore and Anmore Green Estates

Issue: The Village of Anmore (the Village) has requested the Province provide mediation/facilitation between the Village and Anmore Green Estates (the strata), in order to reach agreement on sewerage cost allocation. Negotiations to date between the Village and the strata have failed to produce agreement on the increased costs associated with Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (GVSD) membership and sewerage services for the strata. The Village advises that an agreement would assist the Village when creating the local area service to requisition residents for sewer service.

RECOMMENDED OPTION:

- **OPTION 1:** Provide financial support (between \$50-75K) for a facilitator to develop a comprehensive overview of the costs associated with GVSD membership and achieve consensus on cost apportionment or provide a path forward for the two parties.

BACKGROUND:

The septic fields owned and operated by Anmore Green Estates (the strata), a 51-unit strata complex in the Village, have been leaching onto a field, which is now part of Eagle Creek Middle School, since 2001. Leaching increased in 2018 causing a public health risk to children attending the school. As a result of the severity of the situation and the Village's inaction, in December 2018, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (ENV) issued a Minister's order to the Village to do a full Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) under very short timelines (3.5 months). To address the orders and notices, the Village entered into discussions with the strata to connect the strata to the region-wide sewer system operated and governed by the GVSD.

The GVSD is a special purpose body, akin to but legally separate from Metro Vancouver Regional District (Metro), with most Metro municipalities as members. The GVSD Act requires an Order in Council (OIC) for the Village to join the GVSD board.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH) staff provided the Village a list of conditions that must be completed before an OIC can be prepared for the Village's membership in the GVSD. The conditions included: coming to agreement on cost allocation between Village and the strata; Metro amending the Urban Containment Boundary and other changes related to the Village's OCP; as well as board resolutions from the GVSD and Metro supporting the Village's application. The Village, in partnership with Metro and the GVSD, has completed most conditions, with the exception of a method to apportion membership costs to residents of the strata. Although not a legislated requirement, the Village advised MAH staff that an agreement with the strata (e.g. a Memorandum of Understanding) was desired prior to creating a local area service to requisition costs from strata residents (please refer to attachment 2 for additional background information)



DISCUSSION:

The Village and strata have met on at least one occasion and have exchanged several emails since February 2019. The Village has expressed concern that the costs of GVSDD membership and how those costs will be apportioned between the Village and the strata.^{s.13; s.16; s.17}

s.13; s.16; s.17

s.13; s.16; s.17 The strata has expressed, in emails to the Village, its concern that the costs associated with GVSDD membership would more than double the municipal taxes the residents already pay for the foreseeable future.

MAH staff, in discussions with ENV staff, believe that facilitation between the Village and the strata will provide a clear understanding of overall costs to all parties, and either help parties reach a consensus on costs or clarify the final interests of the parties and an outline of a recommended path forward.

Given the impasse of the parties, facilitation is likely the best next step to try and support the parties coming to agreement, however facilitation does present some risk. An example of this is the involvement of the school district which would be subject to the local area service but would not be the focus of facilitation. On March 5, 2019, Chair Hobson of School District 43 wrote to the Minister of MAH expressing her concern about increased costs to the School District as Eagle Creek Middle School would be in the local area service and be serviced by sewer. In response, the Minister suggested that Chair Hobson continue to work with the Village to reach agreement on costs. s.13; s.16; s.17

s.13; s.16; s.17



The proposed Terms of Reference for the facilitator is included as Attachment #1 to this Briefing Note. This has been forwarded to ENV for their approval and comments.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- It is estimated that a facilitator will cost \$50,000 to \$75,000.

OPTIONS:

1. Provide financial support for facilitation between the Village and the strata.

Pros:

s.13; s.16; s.17

- A third-party facilitator would provide clarity to interested parties on the total costs of GVSDD membership.
- May provide for an agreement between the Village and strata on cost apportionment or provide for steps going forward.
- An agreement would provide the basis for a local area service to requisition agreed upon costs from those who benefit from the service.

s.13; s.16; s.17

RECOMMENDATION:

- Option 1

APPROVED (Option 1) / NOT APPROVED

Honourable Selina Robinson

June 5, 2019

Date

**Attachments:**

1. s.13; s.16; s.17
2. Information Briefing Note, "Membership in the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (CLIFF #245449)

PREPARED BY:

Scott Leitch, Governance Analyst
Governance and Structure
(778) 698-1167

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, ADM
Local Government Division

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 17, 2019

May 24, 2019

Page 047 of 136 to/à Page 048 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16 ; s.17



ATTACHMENT 2

BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: April 16, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Membership in the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District

Issue: Anmore Green Estates, a strata complex in the Village of Anmore, has been leaching sewage effluent onto an adjacent public school property since at least 2001. In response, the Village of Anmore has entered into discussions with Anmore Green Estates to determine the allocation of costs associated with sewer connection to Anmore Green Estates and membership in the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (GVSD).

Meeting With: Mayor McEwen, Village of Anmore on April 18, 2019

KEY MESSAGES:

- **I am pleased to hear of the progress made by Anmore to amend its Official Community Plan (OCP) and by Metro to reclassify the strata land in an effort to address the leaching of sewage effluent onto the Eagle Creek Middle School field.**
- **I would encourage Anmore and Anmore Green Estates to work together to develop a mutually beneficial agreement that will lead to a permanent solution to the issue.**
- **I appreciate that coming to an agreement on allocating costs of the service going forward is difficult. I know this has been a long-standing issue in the community and that resolving the issue may mean some compromise for all parties to be able to move forward.**

• s.13

SUMMARY:

The septic fields owned and operated by Anmore Green Estates (the strata), a 51-unit strata complex in the Village, have been leaching onto a field, which is now part of Eagle Creek Middle School, since 2001. Leaching increased in 2018 causing a public health risk to children attending the school. Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (MOE) has been issuing progressively more punitive pollution abatement orders to the strata to protect public health and environment. MOE has advised that the strata is in compliance with the orders to mitigate the health risks.

As a result of the severity of the situation, in December 2018, MOE issued a separate Minister's order to the Village to do a full Liquid Waste Management Plan (LWMP) under very short timelines (3.5 months). To address the order and notices, the Village has entered into discussions with the strata to connect the strata to the region-wide sewer system operated and governed by the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District (GVSD). The GVSD is a special purpose body, akin to but legally separate from Metro Vancouver Regional District (Metro), with most Metro municipalities as members.

The *GVSD Act* requires an Order in Council (OIC) for the Village to join the GVSD board. However, before that can happen, it is expected that the Village and the strata come to an agreement determining the allocation of costs associated with membership and connection. s.13; s.16; s.17

s.13; s.16; s.17



s.13; s.16; s.17

There is currently no agreement between the Village and the strata to pay the costs of connecting to the GVSDD system and joining the GVSDD. Currently, the strata has petitioned the Supreme Court of British Columbia regarding the strata's interest in further development of residential units to offset the costs of connecting and membership.

s.13; s.14; s.16; s.17

BACKGROUND:

The Village does not offer a municipal sewage collection service and buildings are serviced by on-site septic that are the responsibility of property owners to operate and maintain in accordance with relevant legislation and municipal bylaws (for detailed background on the issue please see IBN CLIFF# 242694).

In 2017, routine sampling of soil found *E. coli*, traced to the strata located within the Village on the border with Port Moody. MOE issued a Pollution Abatement Order to the strata in September 2017, directing them to correct the system and initiate mitigation measures in the interim. The strata commissioned a report which concluded that a retrofit of the current septic system would not stop the leaching into the adjacent school property because of insufficient land area on the site to comply with requirements of the Municipal Wastewater Regulation under MOE's *Environmental Management Act*. The report's author (with agreement of MOE consultants) recommended a connection to the GVSDD system through Port Moody as the most affordable and feasible option. In response to this report, the strata indicated in the media and in emails addressed to the Village that residents would be willing to pay for the connection and for ongoing costs but did not commit to paying for the Village's GVSDD membership levies.

In late 2018, MOE issued an order requiring the Village to develop a LWMP in a very short time frame (approximately 3.5 months with an April 30 deadline). In response, the Village Council passed a resolution in late 2018 directing staff "to make an application to the GVSDD to facilitate connection of the strata to the regional sewer system and that the strata will be responsible for all costs associated with the initial connection and ongoing costs associated with connection to a regional sewerage system". The connection and membership in the GVSDD would satisfy the Minister's outstanding order against the Village. Village staff then connected with MAH staff who explained the OIC process and advised on the necessary steps required for membership.

Membership in the GVSDD

The GVSDD includes most Metro members (except Anmore, Belcarra, Bowen Island and Lions Bay) and manages the construction, maintenance, operation, and administration of the major sewerage and drainage facilities in Metro Vancouver. The GVSDD was incorporated by the *Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District Act* (GVSD Act) in 1956 (prior to modern regional districts) and is overseen by a Board of Directors made up of elected officials from member municipalities. A municipality may be made a member of the GVSDD by OIC and Cabinet which has sole discretion to order or refuse such membership.



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

DISCUSSION:

s.13; s.14; s.16



s.13; s.14; s.16

s.13; s.14; s.16

After Council turned down this request, the strata then petitioned the British Columbia (BC) Supreme Court to compel the Village to allow for the building of a subdivision on top of the septic field once it is decommissioned. On October 19, 2018, the petition for an expedited ruling was rejected; a BC Supreme Court date has yet to be set. s.13; s.14; s.16

s.13; s.14; s.16

School District Concerns

s.13; s.16

This was in response to the

s.13; s.16

GVSD Board's March 14, 2019 decision to cancel the existing agreement between the School District and the GVSD that allows for sewer services to School property after the Village becomes a member of the GVSD. The School District owns one property within the Village that is currently being served by sewer through an agreement with the GVSD and the School District currently pays flow charges to adjacent Port Moody without additional tax in relation to infrastructure. Once the Village becomes a member of the GVSD, the School District will then be taxed according to the Village's costs with service levels remaining the same.

s.13; s.16



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.13; s.16

Next Steps

s.13; s.14; s.16

PREPARED BY:

Scott Leitch, Governance Analyst
Governance and Structure Branch
(250) 698-1167

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

April 12, 2019

April 16, 2019



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 30, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: University Endowment Lands

Meeting With: MLA David Eby, Vancouver – Pointe Grey on May 30, 2019 regarding UEL governance review and complaints management.

BACKGROUND:

The topic of governance remains an important issue on the Point Grey Peninsula as the University Endowment Lands (UEL) continues to face a number of challenges and pressures, including development, changing demographics and community demand for change, as well as a representation gap.

s.13

The UEL Administration successfully responds to majority of issues or complaints raised by residents and non-residents (*see Attachment 2*), but is ultimately limited by constraints of direct provincial administration under the current framework of UEL's services and structure.

s.13

DISCUSSION:

The Minister recently reconnected with a number of key parties on the Peninsula on this issue, including elected representatives of the Musqueam First Nation, the City of Vancouver, Metro Vancouver and the UEL's Community Advisory Council (and with UBC at the ADM-level) to canvass their perspectives on proceeding with a study for the UEL; no significant challenges or concerns were raised.

Staff are continuing work to build the detailed parameters for a multi-year '*UEL Services & Structure*' study that will begin later this fall (*to maximize availability of qualified external consultants, an RFP for the study is expected to go public early fall 2019*). The study is expected to conclude in late fall 2021.

The study will comprehensively explore the impacts of pursuing change with the aim of providing a clear and tangible understanding on a range of topics around the services and structure arrangements for the UEL. The study will be an important first step in finding a longer-term solution for the many challenges and pressures that continue to challenge the UEL's current arrangements (*see Attachment 1 for a summary of study*).

To inform the Minister's meeting with MLA Eby, the following information is attached.

1. **Summary of Services & Structure Study:** provides summary of study including its purpose, goals, roles, deliverables and what would be studied within each of the four study components.
2. **(a) UEL Complaints Management (IBN #243306); and**
(b) information for MLA for overview of existing complaint processes and information on specific UEL issues.



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

PREPARED BY:

Rena Bindra, Senior Policy Analyst
LG Policy, Research & Legislation
778-698-3466

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 29, 2019

May 30, 2019



ATTACHMENT 1: SUMMARY OF UEL SERVICES & STRUCTURE STUDY

PURPOSE

The University Endowment Lands (UEL) is unique as the only urban area in B.C. directly administered by the Province. This traditional territory of the Musqueam First Nation and once small urban residential community is changing rapidly and facing population growth, development projects, infrastructure needs, and other pressures. As well, there are multiple interests in the UEL community, including residents, the Musqueam First Nation, other governments such as Metro Vancouver Regional District, neighbours such as City of Vancouver and University of British Columbia, and various service providers including different provincial agencies.

The proposed UEL Services and Structure Study will help facilitate a discussion among UEL residents and key parties, helping to identify any potential opportunities to enhance efficient delivery of services that citizens need. The study will provide the opportunity for interests to be explored, responsibility for services to be understood, and lay the groundwork for the Province to consider options for potentially shifting to a new structure for service provision and jurisdiction. The study is one step in reviewing UEL services and structure.

GOALS

The goals of the study would include the following (the specific components of the study to be undertaken further to the goals are *outlined in the attached table*):

- **Identifying service delivery gaps** – lay the groundwork to facilitate closing service delivery gaps and corresponding representation gap. UEL residents do not have a local government providing them local services and local jurisdiction is how communities can best meet the service and other interests of their citizens.
- **Clarifying the current state of the UEL** – a full understanding of current service delivery structures will be an important first step for clarifying current responsibilities for providing services to and by the UEL.
- **Assessing transition matters** – it will be important to identify internal (to the province) and external (to interests) issues and transition implications, and inventory what needs to be resolved, prior to any shift in service responsibilities in the UEL.
- **Gathering perspectives of community & others through engagement and exploring interests** – structured conversations on jurisdiction and services will provide a way for the Province to hear from residents and key stakeholders to better understand issues and perspectives around responsibilities and service provision.
- **Understanding options and impacts of change** – the above inputs as well as technical analysis will identify options for future UEL service delivery and structures as well as feasibility and potential costs of different options.

ROLES

Province's role focuses on facilitating the study:

- Developing terms of reference and procurement documents
- Retaining/funding consultant(s) to work with the key parties
- Providing consultant(s) with existing information (e.g. fact sheets, previous studies)
- Managing procurement processes and contracts



- Directing additional activities related to the study, including providing guidance on internal provincial matters that require review
- Engaging internally with other provincial interests (e.g. other ministries)
- Developing a communication plan
- Providing ongoing engagement with the Musqueam First Nation, including in relation to provincial Crown land consultation obligations
- Providing advanced communication to the residents and key parties about the study as it is initiated, and continuing to check in on interests as the study progresses

Contractor(s)' role focuses on fulfilling the goals of the study (see above) by:

- Reviewing and updating existing information on UEL, including a community profile and picture of existing services
- Ongoing meetings with Ministry staff to review how various matters can be addressed and what additional steps are needed
- Preparing an engagement plan for review by the Ministry
- Using outreach techniques to engage residents and key parties in multiple ways and manners (e.g. technology, public open houses, surveys, and interviews)
- Providing a written report on the perspectives of the community and other key parties
- Providing a written report on the technical costs of change in governance including analyzing "comparator" & neighbour municipalities
- Identifying and cataloguing key policy and implementation issues and questions that will need to be addressed, including for the Province and for others
- Providing a final report which includes information on how to resolve matters and/or identify next steps

KEY PARTIES

s.13; s.16

Other key parties s.13; s.16

- Community Advisory Council of the UEL
- City of Vancouver
- Metro Vancouver Regional District
- University of British Columbia

KEY DELIVERABLES (EST.)

s.13; s.16

KEY COMPONENTS OF A UEL SERVICES & STRUCTURE STUDY

	CLARIFYING CURRENT STATE OF UEL	ASSESSING TRANSITION MATTERS	PERSPECTIVES OF COMMUNITY & OTHERS	TECHNICAL COSTS & IMPACTS OF CHANGE
<i>Est. Target Deliverable:</i>		s.13; s.16		s.13; s.16
<i>Purpose(s)</i>	To develop a complete, updated picture of the UEL to serve as a baseline for education, comparison and engagement	To identify, and create a transition plan provincial and other matters which would need to be addressed to implement any service and structure change		
<i>Key Activities</i>	Update baseline of current state of UEL to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish current key community indicators, such as population, demographics, boundaries • Develop a comprehensive catalogue of existing services, their delivery, and decision-making processes • Describe the different roles, responsibilities and jurisdictions of all service providers Identify current and future development and other pressures facing the community/area.	Catalogue transition & implementation issues related to provincial matters, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial assets & liabilities, staffing and other areas of direct provincial administration • Land & other development matters: First Nation impacts; Crown land and parks • Provincial service delivery, such as roads, policing, fire services contract Identify key relevant transition impacts and issues related to other interests / community		
<i>What will be Involved</i>	For services: identifying costs, cost recovery methods, decision-making processes, interactions among service providers & service issues and pressures. Compiling other baseline data for use further on in process (e.g. maps). Cataloguing trends, current and future pressures (e.g. population growth; development; regional).	Engaging and liaising with range of internal provincial agencies, UEL staff, other provincial employees and others. Province continuing to work with Musqueam First Nation to understand potential impacts/issues.		



ATTACHMENT 2a (IBN #243306)

BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: January 17, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: University Endowment Lands Complaints Management

Issue: The University Endowment Lands (UEL) Administration manages – and addresses -- dozens of complaints (issues or concerns) raised by residents and non-residents on a weekly basis. In some cases complaints come to the attention of the MLA or other elected officials, particularly when the response to the individual does not meet their desired outcome. This note outlines the UEL process for managing complaints.

SUMMARY:

- **The UEL Administration successfully responds to the majority of issues or complaints raised by residents and non-residents directly or by directing them to the appropriate jurisdiction.**
- **In dealing with complaints, the UEL Administration carefully balances the resources available with the work priorities for the community, directing resources for specific concerns first to public safety and critical infrastructure needs.**
- **The UEL Administration is unique as a small provincial workforce providing municipally-similar, but not entirely the same, services and service levels to an unincorporated community of approximately 3,000 residents in a highly urban context while remaining cost-neutral to government.**
- **Legislative tools available to the UEL for provision of services and responding to complaints are limited and do not include many provisions typically available to local governments. For example, the UEL does not have bylaw enforcement staff or ticketing authority.**
- **As the MLA is sometimes approached by UEL residents with complaints, the Minister may wish to share this information with the constituency office in some form.**

BACKGROUND:

The UEL Administration is unique; approximately 19 provincial staff provide municipal-like services to a community of approximately 3,000 UEL residents on part of the Point Grey peninsula. UEL Administration comprises 3 general groups of staff – Public Works; Development Services (building and land use); and Corporate (management/administrative).

While unincorporated, the UEL is highly urbanized, comprising high-value single family neighbourhoods (Areas A, B and C) plus a multi-family and commercial area (Area D). The UEL operates under an old legislative framework, with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as the ultimate legal authority (bylaw maker) and the UEL Manager responsible for day-to-day administration. The UEL provides essential local services while operating under provincial rules and remaining cost-neutral to government. In recent years, the UEL has become increasingly dynamic, with a changing demographic of property owners, accelerated single-family redevelopment and building now commencing on the large-scale lelām development which will ultimately add 2,500 residents, multi-family towers and a new commercial area to the UEL.



UEL Administration receives issues or concerns from residents and non-residents in person (across the front counter), through correspondence (email uel@gov.bc.ca and letter), by telephone and through the Manager's interaction with the Community Advisory Council (CAC).

A significant number of the issues raised by non-residents are not within the UEL's jurisdiction, usually as a result of confusion over where the individual actually lives (e.g. residents in the West Point Grey area, including University of British Columbia and UEL, all have Vancouver as their postal and/or driver's licence address). Most commonly, these issues are redirected to the adjacent jurisdictions of UBC, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (or their road maintenance contractor) or the City of Vancouver.

The majority of complaints that are within the UEL's jurisdiction are dealt with satisfactorily or referred to the appropriate agency (e.g. BC Assessment). In some cases, because the UEL is not an incorporated municipality with an elected mayor and council, complaints are elevated by the complainant to the MLA, particularly when the response to the individual does not meet their desired outcome or the matter appears to be taking a long time to resolve.

Issue Management/Resolution

The vast majority of complaints are dealt with as they arise but time frames for addressing them will differ depending on the nature of the issue. For example:

- Requests for dog licences, parking permits, concerns about water billing or payment, etc. are common and usually dealt with immediately.
- Water or sewer service problems in the public realm are dealt with as emergencies (public safety) or as soon as Public Works staff are available.
- Water or sewer service problems where the evidence suggests the issue is on private property are referred back to the property owner (as is common in municipalities), with follow up by Public Works staff if needed and subject to availability (e.g. not if they are dealing with other emergency or public safety situations).
- Requests for business licences, oil tank removal permits, special water meter reading, building drawings in archive or other matters that may take staff some time or investigation to resolve are dealt with in a "first in – first out" queue and depend on staff resource availability.
- Street light outages are tracked, compiled and addressed when sufficient volume warrants, assigning them to a contractor with specialised equipment to make the necessary repairs. Public safety is paramount, so consideration is given to the number of lights out in a given area, whether there are plans for upgrades to LED lighting there, time of year and location (e.g. near schools in September), etc.
- Street lamp posts damaged by motor vehicles are dealt with as emergencies owing to electrical exposure (public safety).
- Sidewalk tripping hazards are patrolled and maintenance is scheduled annually, to optimize staff availability and weather conditions for repair (consistent with practices in municipalities and a prudent policy approach to potential legal liability).
- Public realm tree issues are addressed depending on circumstance:
 - a fallen or falling tree that poses a public risk (e.g. car hitting a tree) is dealt with as quickly as staff are available.



- tree maintenance, including replacement of removed or dying trees, is planned for and carried out depending on budget. All public boulevard trees are inventoried, but it may be 2-4 years before a tree is replaced (determined by the urban tree management plan and annual tree maintenance priority).
- Land use matters, such as zoning, development permit or building permit questions are either dealt with directly as they come in (e.g. information provided) or referred to the Development Services staff (e.g. application intake) to manage through established processes under bylaw provisions, including appeals of statutory decisions.

Unresolved Issues

There are a number of chronic issues or complaints that persist or are raised seasonally or may take a number of years to resolve; in other cases, they are raised and not resolved to the satisfaction of complainants. These issues are often repeatedly cited in the University Hill Connections newspaper (published by the CAC with distribution limited to UEL residents) or raised with the MLA or Electoral Area Director and sometimes with the Minister.

Some recent examples include:

Waste deposit in alleyways in Area D has increased. The implementation of the province-wide recycle collection program, coinciding with the closure of the UEL recycle yard, resulted in an increase in the amount of waste (often large items such as mattresses and furniture) left in Area D alleyways by transient residents (students) leaving at the end of school term. Waste disposal in this multi-family neighbourhood is the responsibility of the building owners (as it is in municipalities). This is a recurring problem that has been addressed intermittently by building owners or Public Works staff conducting removal of the waste, however it requires a more permanent solution.

Hedges or plantings impinging on sidewalks or hedge heights are common complaints in the spring / summer. Many of these are addressed by letters of instruction sent by the UEL Administration to the homeowner, however a number are not, with an increased perception from concerned community members that these are because of new out-of-town or foreign purchased properties. The UEL bylaws state “the Manager may order removal...” but fall short of providing legal enforcement options.

Property vacancy and disrepair is a more recent and increased problem in the single-family neighbourhoods (e.g. properties purchased and not maintained). Generally, this can be addressed when the property owner applies for a development permit and comes to understand the importance of good-neighbour relations, especially during the comment period for the permit application. However before then, UEL Administration often lack the new property owner’s contact information or they do not respond.

Camping on Blanca Street has been a complaint by one non-resident that subsequently garnered interest of CAC representatives. Blanca Street is a shared jurisdiction with the City of Vancouver. A number of years ago up to four motorhomes parked along the UEL side of the street. Individuals were living in some of those motorhomes. Parking enforcement in the UEL is contracted and prioritized to those areas having greatest impact to residents or businesses, typically closer to the university, or for public safety. s.13

s.13

s.13

After enforcement action in 2016, no motorhomes have returned. However, the matter continues to be raised based on expectations beyond what the bylaw provides.



Poor water quality in Area C is cited in the University Hill Connections October 2018 newspaper as an issue that did not receive adequate action. In fact the UEL administration had started to take action to resolve a potential water quality issue staff identified well before residents became aware of it. Unfortunately engineering, tendering and construction of the solution (replacement of a substantial water main) took much longer than expected and the water aesthetic quality deteriorated in the interim. Vancouver Coastal Health were apprised of the situation throughout and at no time was water quality below drinking water quality guidelines. The necessary infrastructure repairs were completed in 2016 thereby eliminating water discolouration in the neighbourhood.

DISCUSSION:

The UEL Administration works to resolve as many issues or complaints raised by community members as quickly as possible and, wherever possible, to the satisfaction of those concerned. The vast majority of day-to-day issues are resolved. Staff shortages sometimes hinder timely response but most residents can understand delays. There are, however, some issues that cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction, sometimes due to service-level expectations beyond UEL Administration capacity, or where the solution would require significant changes (e.g. new legislation).

For example, the UEL does not have ticketing authority or the provision for collection of tickets that municipalities can access. ^{s.13}

s.13

■ s.22

UEL Governance

UEL's unique status, in which the provincial government is providing municipal-like services, contributes in a number of ways to the challenges faced in managing and resolving complaints:

- the existing UEL legislation and structure were never designed for a dynamic, developing community facing modern urban challenges, meaning the UEL lacks the tools and capacity of a municipality;
- the UEL Administration competes directly with local governments for hiring specialized staff resources;
- provincial administration means that the routine focus for complaints is the Province (i.e. where a municipality is in place, complaints to provincial representatives are the exception, not the rule);
- the lack of direct local governance (such as a municipal council) creates underlying frustration for UEL residents, especially the CAC, regarding lack of local democratic control over UEL affairs.



Existing and Future Opportunities

The UEL Administration routinely provides information to residents and other interested parties to proactively address issues before they become complaints. s.13

s.13 t and include the Manager's discussions with the CAC, articles written by UEL staff for the University Hill Connections newspaper and updates to the UEL websites;
www.universityendowmentlands.gov.bc.ca and www.AreaDPlan.ca.

There are also opportunities for improvements that could reduce complaints. For example, waste deposit in Area D alleyways is an issue with no immediate obvious solution but one that likely can be resolved. In this case, working with the CAC, the UEL Administration is developing an Area D Neighbourhood Plan. Waste disposal in alleyways is one of a number of issues that can be addressed in this planning process, but that process will take a number of months and may ultimately lead to recommendations for bylaw changes.

s.13

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- None

Attachments: (1)

1. s.13

PREPARED BY:

Jonn Braman, Manager
University Endowment Lands
(604) 660-1810 ex. 28

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, ADM
Local Government Division

Jacqueline Dawes, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

January 14, 2019

January 17, 2019



Attachment 2b: Information for MLA

University Endowment Lands Complaints Management (March 2019)

SUMMARY:

- The UEL Administration successfully responds to the majority of issues or complaints raised by residents and non-residents directly or by directing them to the appropriate jurisdiction.
- In dealing with complaints, the UEL Administration carefully balances the resources available with the work priorities for the community, directing resources for specific concerns first to public safety and critical infrastructure needs.
- The UEL Administration is unique as a small provincial workforce providing municipally-similar, but not entirely the same, services and service levels to an unincorporated community of approximately 3,000 residents in a highly urban context while remaining cost-neutral to government.
- Legislative tools available to the UEL for provision of services and responding to complaints are limited and do not include many provisions typically available to local governments. For example, the UEL does not have bylaw enforcement staff or ticketing authority.
- UEL's unique status (in which the provincial government is providing municipal-like services) contributes in a number of ways to the challenges faced in managing and resolving some complaints. While not yet public, when it is launched, the proposed services and structure study process will be an important step along the multi-year path to a change in governance and will also provide another outlet through which UEL residents can engage/express their views as to key issues in the UEL.

BACKGROUND:

The UEL Administration is unique; approximately 19 provincial staff provide municipal-like services to a community of approximately 3,000 UEL residents on part of the Point Grey peninsula. UEL Administration comprises 3 general groups of staff – Public Works; Development Services (building and land use); and Corporate (management/administrative).

While unincorporated, the UEL is highly urbanized, comprising high-value single family neighbourhoods (Areas A, B and C) plus a multi-family and commercial area (Area D). The UEL operates under an old legislative framework, with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing as the ultimate legal authority (bylaw maker) and the UEL Manager responsible for day-to-day administration. The UEL provides essential local services while operating under provincial rules and remaining cost-neutral to government. In recent years, the UEL has become increasingly dynamic, with a changing demographic of property owners, accelerated single-family redevelopment and building now commencing on the large-scale leləm development which will ultimately add 2,500 residents, multi-family towers and a new commercial area to the UEL. The UEL is also an area of multiple interests, including Musqueam First Nation (as key fee simple property owner and with Indigenous rights claims), other governments (e.g. Metro Vancouver Regional District), neighbours (e.g. UBC; Vancouver), various provincial agencies (e.g. Ministry of Transportation) and community representatives (Community Advisory Council (CAC)).



UEL Administration receives issues or concerns from residents and non-residents in person (across the front counter), through correspondence (email uel@gov.bc.ca and letter), by telephone (604 660-1808) and through the Manager's interaction with the CAC.

A significant number of the issues raised by non-residents are not within the UEL's jurisdiction, usually as a result of confusion over where the individual actually lives (e.g. residents in the West Point Grey area, including University of British Columbia and UEL, all have Vancouver as their postal and/or driver's licence address). Most commonly, these issues are redirected to the adjacent jurisdictions of UBC, Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (or their road maintenance contractor) or the City of Vancouver.

The majority of complaints that are within the UEL's jurisdiction are dealt with satisfactorily or referred to the appropriate agency (e.g. BC Assessment). In some cases, because the UEL is not an incorporated municipality with an elected mayor and council, complaints are elevated by the complainant to the MLA, particularly when the response to the individual does not meet their desired outcome or the matter appears to be taking a long time to resolve.

Issue Management/Resolution

The vast majority of complaints are dealt with as they arise but time frames for addressing them will differ depending on the nature of the issue. For example:

- Requests for dog licences, parking permits, concerns about water billing or payment, etc. are common and usually dealt with immediately.
- Water or sewer service problems in the public realm are dealt with as emergencies (public safety) or as soon as Public Works staff are available.
- Water or sewer service problems where the evidence suggests the issue is on private property are referred back to the property owner (as is common in municipalities), with follow up by Public Works staff if needed and subject to availability (e.g. not if they are dealing with other emergency or public safety situations).
- Requests for business licences, oil tank removal permits, special water meter reading, building drawings in archive or other matters that may take staff some time or investigation to resolve are dealt with in a "first in – first out" queue and depend on staff resource availability.
- Street light outages are tracked, compiled and addressed when sufficient volume warrants, assigning them to a contractor with specialised equipment to make the necessary repairs. Public safety is paramount, so consideration is given to the number of lights out in a given area, whether there are plans for upgrades to LED lighting there, time of year and location (e.g. near schools in September), etc.
- Street lamp posts damaged by motor vehicles are dealt with as emergencies owing to electrical exposure (public safety).
- Sidewalk tripping hazards are patrolled and maintenance is scheduled annually, to optimize staff availability and weather conditions for repair (consistent with practices in municipalities and a prudent policy approach to potential legal liability).
- Public realm tree issues are addressed depending on circumstance:
 - a fallen or falling tree that poses a public risk (e.g. car hitting a tree) is dealt with as quickly as staff are available.



- tree maintenance, including replacement of removed or dying trees, is planned for and carried out depending on budget. All public boulevard trees are inventoried, but it may be 2-4 years before a tree is replaced (determined by the urban tree management plan and annual tree maintenance priority).
- Land use matters, such as zoning, development permit or building permit questions are either dealt with directly as they come in (e.g. information provided) or referred to the Development Services staff (e.g. application intake) to manage through established processes under bylaw provisions, including appeals of statutory decisions.

More Challenging Issues

There are a number of chronic issues or complaints that persist or are raised seasonally or may take a number of years to resolve; in other cases, they are raised and may not be resolved to the satisfaction of complainants. These issues are often repeatedly cited in the University Hill Connections newspaper (published by the CAC with distribution limited to UEL residents) or raised with the MLA or Electoral Area Director and sometimes with the Minister.

Some recent examples include:

Waste deposit in alleyways in Area D has increased. The implementation of the province-wide recycle collection program, coinciding with the closure of the UEL recycle yard, resulted in an increase in the amount of waste (often large items such as mattresses and furniture) left in Area D alleyways by transient residents (students) leaving at the end of school term. Waste disposal in this multi-family neighbourhood is the responsibility of the building owners (as it is in municipalities). This is a recurring problem that has been addressed intermittently by building owners or Public Works staff conducting removal of the waste, however it requires a more permanent solution. This issue has been included in the Area D Neighbourhood Plan process currently underway, which may ultimately lead to recommendations for bylaw changes.

Hedges or plantings impinging on sidewalks or hedge heights are common complaints in the spring / summer. Many of these are addressed by letters of instruction sent by the UEL Administration to the homeowner, however a number are not, with an increased perception from concerned community members that these are because of new out-of-town or foreign purchased properties. The UEL bylaws state "*the Manager may order removal...*" but fall short of providing legal enforcement options. UEL does not have ticketing authority or the provision for collection of tickets as municipalities do.

Property vacancy and disrepair is a more recent and increased problem in the single-family neighbourhoods (e.g. properties purchased and not maintained). Generally, this can be addressed when the property owner applies for a development permit and comes to understand the importance of good-neighbour relations, especially during the comment period for the permit application. However before then, UEL Administration often lack the new property owner's contact information or they do not respond. If that information is available, UEL follows up with letters of instruction to the property owners.

Camping on Blanca Street has been a complaint by one non-resident that subsequently garnered interest of CAC representatives. Blanca Street is a shared jurisdiction with the City of Vancouver. A number of years ago up to four motorhomes parked along the UEL side of the street. Individuals were living in some of those motorhomes. Parking enforcement in the UEL is contracted and prioritized to those areas having greatest impact to residents or businesses, typically closer to the university, or for public safety. Blanca is not a priority area for parking enforcement as the impact to UEL residents is limited and enforcement of overnight provisions of the bylaw is



costly and legally challenging. After enforcement action in 2016, no motorhomes had returned. However, the matter continues to be raised based on expectations beyond what the bylaw provides.

Poor water quality in Area C is cited in the University Hill Connections October 2018 newspaper as an issue that did not receive adequate action. In fact, the UEL administration had started to take action to resolve a potential water quality issue staff identified well before residents became aware of it. Unfortunately engineering, tendering and construction of the solution (replacement of a substantial water main) took much longer than expected and the water aesthetic quality deteriorated in the interim. Vancouver Coastal Health were apprised of the situation throughout and at no time was water quality below drinking water quality guidelines. The necessary infrastructure repairs were completed in 2016 thereby eliminating water discolouration in the neighbourhood.

Routine Communications

The UEL Administration routinely provides information to residents and other interested parties to proactively address issues before they become complaints. These include the Manager's discussions with the CAC, articles written by UEL staff for the University Hill Connections newspaper and updates to the UEL websites; www.universityendowmentlands.gov.bc.ca and www.AreaDPlan.ca.

UEL Governance

UEL's unique status, in which the provincial government is providing municipal-like services, contributes in a number of ways to the challenges faced in managing and resolving complaints:

- the existing UEL legislation and structure were never designed for a dynamic, developing community facing modern urban challenges, meaning the UEL lacks the tools and capacity of a municipality;
- the UEL Administration competes directly with local governments for hiring specialized staff resources;
- provincial administration means that the routine focus for complaints is the Province (i.e. where a municipality is in place, complaints to provincial representatives are the exception, not the rule);
- the lack of direct local governance (such as a municipal council) creates underlying frustration for UEL residents, especially the CAC, regarding lack of local democratic control over UEL affairs.

While not yet made public, the Ministry is currently undertaking groundwork for the potential launch of a services and structure study process that will start to look at the technical issues underlying a potential change in governance, as well as providing opportunities for UEL residents to engage in that conversation and share their views about the UEL.

March 2019



MEETING BRIEFING NOTE

Date: June 25, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Black Mountain Irrigation District (BMID)

Issue: BMID and integration with the City of Kelowna water system.

Meeting With: Mayor Colin Basran and City Manager Doug Gilchrist, City of Kelowna on June 26, 2019.

KEY MESSAGES:

- I commend you that City staff have been rebuilding trust with the improvement districts, and through pro-active engagement and long-term planning initiatives, the City is building on its reputation as a strategic leadership organization.
- I encourage you to maintain this focus on building a strong collaborative approach with all stakeholders, to celebrate your early successes and demonstrate how this approach can lead toward positive outcomes through integration.
- I am encouraged by the leadership the City is taking with the initiation of the Kelowna Area Based Water Management Plan. This holistic and collaborative approach to water management with the Regional District of Central Okanagan (RDCO), the Okanagan Basin Water Board (OBWB), the Okanagan Nation Alliance and the Provincial Liaison Committee will go a long way to securing the long-term goals and objectives of all stakeholders.
- The Provincial position on dissolution has not changed; we will not force dissolution.
- And, our policy position on infrastructure grant funding has not changed either. We will not provide funding to improvement districts unless they agree to be dissolved and their services transferred to a local government. Therefore, for future grant programs, the City would be the official applicant.
- Regarding the ongoing situation with BMID, I am sad to hear that the BMID long standing Board Chair Gord Ivans passed away in late March.

s.13; s.16



s.13; s.16

BACKGROUND:

In 2009, MAH began working with the City of Kelowna (City) on a path forward to resolving the water issues in the region. The City, the South East Kelowna Irrigation District, the BMID, the Rutland Water Works District, and the Glenmore-Ellison Improvement District (IDs) with support from the Province developed the 2012 *Kelowna Integrated Water Supply Plan* (Plan).

The Plan consists of eight phases with an estimated cost of \$360 million. It was accepted by the elected officials from each of the water utilities and by City Council. The Plan also received feedback from MAH and various Ministries and formed the first cooperative approach on water quality improvement projects in Kelowna that aimed to integrate the systems. As stated in 2012, the Plan was required to undergo a Value Planning/Engineering exercise conducted by Certified Value Specialist engineers with no direct connection to the City or the associated water systems to assess the Plan. Value Planning/Engineering assessments are a standard requirement for large complex projects seeking ministry funding. It took over four years for the parties to agree to undergo a Value Planning (VP) process.

In November 2016, the then Minister met with Kelowna water service providers to continue to support their efforts to draft common principles and terms of reference on the VP process for the Plan.

At the time, the City, and the four IDs agreed to a statement of principles and terms of reference for a VP process. On December 20, 2016, three of the four improvement districts (BMID, Rutland Water Works District and Glenmore-Ellison Improvement District) pulled away from the VP process. The three districts maintained that their water systems met necessary Interior Health Authority requirements and they did not need any significant infrastructure funding. These three IDs agreed to continue to move forward with their respective plans on their own.

In January 2017, the Plan underwent a VP process carried out by Strategic Value Solutions, a Certified Value Specialist consulting firm from Missouri -s.13

s.13

The City and the South East Kelowna Irrigation District (SEKID) participated in the VP exercise along with MAH, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (ENV), and the Ministry of Forest, Land, Natural Resource Operation and Rural Development (FLNRORD) and the Interior Health Authority.

As a result of this VP exercise, the 2012 Plan was significantly amended and became the 2017 *Kelowna Integrated Water Supply Plan*. The original 2012 Plan was limited in scope to simply inter-connecting the existing systems with pipe so that one system could supply water to another – it was not a true integration plan. The VP exercise considered all information from the 2012 Plan, including information from the improvement districts that were not participating – while the City did not have the most current and fulsome dataset on the ID assets, the City has privileged access to much of the ID asset data through their development permitting process. The 2017 *Kelowna Integrated Water Supply Plan* looks at how all systems could one day be truly integrated.

In March 2017, the City's Drinking Water Integration Project, estimated at \$63.7 million was approved under the Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) for \$43.9 million in combined federal and provincial funding. The project will integrate two improvement district systems into the City system: the SEKID system and a smaller irrigation only system called South Mission Irrigation District (SOMID). In April 2018, Treasury Board approved an additional \$12 million in provincial funding to support increased project



costs, being funded outside of the CWWF program. This additional funding was an extremely unique situation – the ministry has no record of providing additional funding to projects experiencing cost increases once approved. Additional funds were approved due to unique circumstance beyond the City's control – cost estimates provided by the improvement districts were significantly understated – and to support an additional project element not part of the original scope: a large water trunk main that will be able to supply water both up from the lakeshore to the areas within the City far from the lake, as well as be able to flow water in the opposite direction too

While additional funding was being secured, the Order in Council (OIC) for dissolving both SEKID and the SOMID was approved and the two irrigation districts have been dissolved.

In early 2019, there was an issue in BMID with slope stability that compromised their primary water main. The City proposed a solution in the form of a water tunnel through bedrock, however BMID declined the City's offer and stated that rather than accept an offer of assistance from the City, BMID would have preferred to approach MAH for financial assistance for a long-term solution to the unstable slope in partnership with the City.

On April 10, 2019, Acting Chair Colin Day from the BMID sent a letter to Mayor Basran stating that they (BMID) have been waiting for six years for the City to engage with them on the *2012 Integrated Water Supply Plan*. As mentioned above, the 2012 Plan formed the basis for the VP exercise that culminated in the *2017 Kelowna Integrated Water Supply Plan*. However, the three improvement districts that did not participate in the VP exercise, including BMID, do not fully support the *2017 Kelowna Integrated Water Supply Plan* s.13

s.13 the best option to advance for future needs. In this letter, BMID also indicated that their slope stability that compromised their primary water main is currently stable. They have developed wells to help to control the groundwater levels on the slope and they state that in the event of a slope failure, they have an emergency supply plan in place to deliver a significant volume of water to BMID customers.

DISCUSSION:

s.13

- Black Mountain Irrigation District
 - Largest ID in the province serving 22,550 people with a large agricultural base
 - Source water is upland hills, open storage reservoirs
- Glenmore Ellison Improvement District
 - Second largest ID in province serving 18,000-19,000 people with a large residential base
 - Source water is Okanagan Lake
- Rutland Waterworks District
 - Fourth largest ID in province serving 14,500 people, almost all residential/commercial
 - Source water is groundwater

Ministry staff have been encouraging the City to take a long-term holistic approach to water, to take into consideration all aspects of water, not just drinking water needs, and to consider the entire watershed, and how their watershed impacts the larger Okanagan water basin – Kelowna is near the top of the basin, thereby impacting all those downstream, eventually impacting neighbouring Washington State. Ministry



staff have encouraged the City to work collaboratively with all relevant stakeholders and to take a leadership position focusing on long-term goals and objectives.

Following this encouragement, the City recently initiated the *Kelowna Area Based Water Management Plan* to consider factors such as climate change, environmental and cultural flow needs as well as flood mitigation and adaptation. This is a strategic multi-year planning initiative, being carried out in partnership with the RDCO, the OBWB, the Okanagan Nation Alliance and a Provincial Liaison Committee. At the request of the City, ministry staff are leading the Provincial Liaison Committee which includes the ENV and the FLNRORD. Staff from the Interior Health Authority are also included in various aspects of the study work.

The result of this work will be a multi-agency strategy for water resource management and agreement by the various agencies to follow-up actions and share ongoing responsibilities.

s.13; s.16

BMID needs to upgrade its primary water transmission main from its reservoir to its customers due to slope instability and poor geotechnical conditions. And although BMID can afford this project without external funding, the City is concerned that if BMID upgrades this pipe without consideration for future integration with the City, the pipe will be under-sized in the event of future integration, resulting in the need for additional investments.

BMID were invited to participate to the VP process which used the 2012 plan as the foundation, however, BMID chose to not partnership with the City and opted out of the VP process.

MAH would still welcome a partnership between the City and BMID, however, it would have to be on the position that BMID would dissolve (dissolution does not have to be immediate, but there must be a binding agreement identifying when the dissolution will occur in the near future).

The City may ask the Minister to meet individually with each ID to encourage them to come back to the discussion table. Some of the IDs have expressed a desire to wait and see how the SEKID/SOMID transition unfolds before they consider further dialog.

s.13; s.16



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.13; s.16

APPENDIX:

A. Summary of Kelowna Funded Projects and Current Applications

PREPARED BY:

Liam Edwards, Executive Director
LG Infrastructure and Finance Branch
(778) 698-3230

APPROVED BY:

Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 16, 2019

May 21, 2019

Appendix A - Summary of City of Kelowna recent applications to grant programs (funded and still under review)

Year	Project Type	Funding Program	Project Title	Project Status	Project total costs	Commitment Amount (Provincial + Partner)
2017	Drinking Water	Clean Water Wastewater Fund (CWWF)	Kelowna Integrated Water – Phase 1	Approved and under Construction	\$56,681,000	\$43,907,000
s.13; s.16						
s.13; s.16						
2018	Drinking Water	Local Government Grant Program (LGGP-PROV)	Kelowna Drinking Water Integration Project – Phase 2	Approved and under construction	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
s.13; s.16						



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: June 24, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Housing and Supports in Kelowna

Issue: Meeting with Mayor Basran to discuss housing and supports for high need individuals in Kelowna

Meeting With: Mayor Colin Basran, City of Kelowna on June 24, 2019.

SUMMARY:

- **The closure of the 80-space Cornerstone shelter was scheduled for June 30, 2019; however, the Province has extended this shelter's operations indefinitely.**
- **BC Housing and the City of Kelowna recognize the challenges in finding an alternate shelter location and continue to work together to find suitable sites.**
- **According to the 2018 homelessness count 286 people in Kelowna have identified as homeless. The BC Housing Supportive Housing Registry has more than 500 people waiting for supportive housing in the Kelowna area.**

BACKGROUND:

As of May 2019, the Province funds 160 permanent and temporary shelter spaces in Kelowna and has allocated \$4.08 million in funding to support the following emergency shelters:

- The Kelowna Gospel Mission, 60 beds
- Alexandra Gardner Women and Children Safe Centre, 20 beds
- Cornerstone, 80 beds

Cornerstone shelter is an 80-bed, temporary shelter that was planned to close June 30, 2019. However, because the city's shelters are consistently full every night and often turn people away, operations have been extended indefinitely as BC Housing and the City of Kelowna continue to seek alternate locations for a replacement shelter.

It's well-documented that the two, high-support shelters, Cornerstone and Kelowna Gospel Mission located close together on Leon Avenue are a challenging and serious concern to City Council, city staff, RCMP and local businesses.

DISCUSSION:

Since 2018, approximately 130 individuals have been transitioned into supportive housing (Gordon Place, Hearthstone, Heath House). BC Housing is working towards developing another three supported projects.

s.17

BC Housing and the City continue to explore potential sites for the 44-units of temporary workforce housing to address the immediate need for Cornerstone guests.



In the Journey Home's report presented to city council earlier this month, it identified a significant gap in the supports needed in Kelowna. Current supports are not able to manage people who live with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder, other developmental disabilities, personality disorders, and those with drug-related psychosis.

Supported housing projects currently in development in Kelowna:

280 McIntosh Road	Up to 50 units (December 2019)	total capital budget of \$15.5 million	50-unit modular constructed, high support homes at 280 McIntosh Road, Kelowna for people experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness
2025 Agassiz Road	Up to 51 units (early summer 2020)	PRHC Board approved a total capital budget of \$15.03 million	On January 17, 2019 Kelowna City Council unanimously passed the 3rd reading of the rezoning permitting supportive housing at 2025 Agassiz Road (a 4th reading is still required).
130 McCurdy Road	49 units – 47 studio and 2 one-bedroom wheelchair modified (February 2021)	PRHC Board approved a total capital budget of \$12.3 million from the Supportive Housing Fund	Culos Development's offer to sell PRHC 49 supported units for 130 McCurdy Road, Kelowna. The Knights of Columbus will also be purchasing space in the building which includes a clubhouse and two additional units. This project aligns with Kelowna's Journey Home Strategy. The Canadian Mental Health Association has been selected to operate this project.

There will be a neighbourhood information session on June 26th for the McCurdy Road project. The session will introduce the Canadian Mental Health Association – Kelowna (CMHA) staff, share renderings of the building and site plan, and address any questions that the community may have.

There has been some community opposition to the project.

Additional Housing Projects:

Construction has begun on a project that is being developed through the HousingHub in partnership with Clement Limited Partnership and PC Urban VA at 726 Clement Avenue in Kelowna. The project targets middle income households and will create 2 purpose built rental apartment buildings.



Here is a list of additional housing in development with BC Housing throughout Kelowna:

Housing Provider	Project Name	Community	Prog	Status	Units
Okanagan Metis & Aboriginal Housing Society	Nissen Crossing: (1170 Highway 33 West)	Kelowna	Investment in Affordable Housing & Social Infrastructure Fund	COM	78
The Society of Housing Opportunities and Progressive Employment	Providence Boulevard (PRHC UNITS)	Kelowna	Prov. Investment in Affordable Housing	COM	21
BC Housing	726 Clement Ave	Kelowna	Prov. Rental Supply	COM	158
Ki-Low-Na Friendship Society	1759 Highway 33 E Margaret's Landing	Kelowna	Indigenous Housing Fund	COM	49
s.16					
New Opportunities for Women (NOW) Canada Society	1044 Cawston Ave, Kelowna	Kelowna	Community Housing Fund	PPA	40
Columbian Centennial Housing Society	1149-1187 Sutherland Avenue, Kelowna	Kelowna	Prov. Rental Supply Housing Priority Initiatives and units under various other programs	COM	36
Pathways Abilities Society Central Okanagan Emergency Shelter Society	555 Fuller Ave (PRHC)	Kelowna		PRO	68
s.13					

Attachment:

1. Summary of City of Kelowna Receipt Applications to Grant Programs

PREPARED BY:

Marie Weeks, Advisor, Indigenous Relations
BC Housing
604-456-8870

APPROVED BY:

Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

June 14, 2019

June 19, 2019

Attachment 1: Summary of City of Kelowna Recent Applications to Grant Programs (funded and still under review):

Year	Project Type	Funding Program	Project Title	Project Status	Project total costs	Commitment Amount (Provincial + Partner)	
2017	Drinking Water	Clean Water Wastewater Fund (CWWF)	Kelowna Integrated Water – Phase 1	Approved and under Construction	\$56,681,000	\$43,907,000	s.13; s.16
2018	Drinking Water	Local Government Grant Program (LGGP-PROV)	Kelowna Drinking Water Integration Project – Phase 2	Approved and under construction	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	s.13; s.16



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 27, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Status of Memorandum of Understanding with Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction regarding new Office of Homelessness Coordination

Meeting With: Honourable Shane Simpson, Minister of Social Development and Poverty Reduction on May 28, 2019

SUMMARY:

- Since February 2019, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH), Housing Policy Branch staff have worked very closely with staff from the new Office of Homelessness Coordination in the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction (SDPR) in crafting an Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to govern the implementation of the Homelessness Action Plan.
- Staff in the two work units have an excellent relationship and believe that the MoU will be an effective tool in delineating responsibilities and eliminating confusion and duplication of effort as they move forward as partners to address the homelessness challenge in BC.
- Most importantly, encampment response management and strategy work will continue to be led by MAH's Housing Policy Branch.

BACKGROUND:

The Homelessness Action Plan (HAP) was developed by staff in the Housing Policy Branch, in collaboration with staff in the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction. The HAP was endorsed by the Housing Working Group and then Cabinet in Fall 2018, and some funding for implementation was provided by Treasury Board as part of *Budget 2019*.

During the Fall, central government also decided that responsibility for the implementation of the HAP would be led by SDPR. As such, almost \$1M /yr. in funding was provided to SDPR in *Budget 2019* to create a new Office of Homelessness Coordination (OHC) to work with other ministries on delivery.

s.12; s.13; s.17



DISCUSSION:

s.13

- **Media Responses on Homelessness Issues:** “MAH GCPE staff will lead communications issues management....”
- **Information Sharing re: Overall HAP Implementation:** There is and will continue to be frequent ongoing communication between the SDPR’s OHC and the MAH Housing Policy Branch, through two mechanisms stipulated in the MoU:
 - “Bi-weekly staff-level working meetings will be held...BC Housing will be invited to participate.”
 - “Bi-annual Executive Partnership meetings will be held” (ADMs Steves and Upton will be the Executive Sponsors)

Finally, staff at MAH Housing Policy Branch and SDPR’s OHC have an excellent working relationship and have been communicating regularly since the transfer of responsibilities has occurred, both with respect to development of the MoU as well as on other issues.

Given the strength of these working relationships, and the MoU language as noted above, staff have significant confidence that implementation of the HAP and management of encampment issues will be conducted in a highly coordinated manner. s.13; s.17

s.13; s.17

Expected Next Steps:

s.12; s.13; s.17



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.12; s.13; s.17

PREPARED BY:

Gord Enemark, A/Executive Director
Housing Policy Branch
(250) 217-6130

APPROVED BY:

Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 22, 2019

May 27, 2019

Page 081 of 136 to/à Page 088 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 24, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Maple Ridge Update

Purpose: To discuss solutions that are acceptable to the community that serve the vulnerable

Meeting With: Mike Morden, Mayor, Maple Ridge, City Council on May 27, 2019.

SUMMARY:

- **BC Housing and the City of Maple Ridge are working together to identify sites for supportive housing and the recovery housing site.**
- **The Burnett project is proceeding according to plan.**
- **The Province and BC Housing will continue to work with the City to create a plan for permanent supportive housing, in consultation with neighbours and the larger community.**

BACKGROUND:

Fraser Health is providing over \$2.5 million in health care services for people who are unhoused and living in shelter and modular housing in Maple Ridge. The existing modular building in Maple Ridge - Royal Crescent –has been open for 6 months. It has a variety of 24/7 supports from Coast Mental Health, including the Intensive Case Management team, nurses, mental health workers and psychiatric services.

People there are connecting to care and working on achieving their recovery goals. We know from Coast Mental Health that people are taking advantage of support services, including addiction treatment.

Four people at the modular housing that opened 6 months ago have been able to move on to other more permanent accommodations.

There are approximately 35-40 people staying every night at the temporary shelter on Lougheed and this shelter is scheduled to close at the end of June.

DISCUSSION:

s.13; s.16; s.17

Page 090 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16 ; s.17



MEETING BRIEFING NOTE

Date: May 24, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth First Nations (MST)
Meeting With: Saisen Gee-Wing and David Negrin on May 28, 2019 (MST affiliation not indicated)
Purpose: s.13; s.16

KEY MESSAGES:

- We recognize and value your commitment to affordable housing.
- We look forward to working together to help you to realize your goals.
- We are committed to seeking new ways to create affordable housing.

SUMMARY:

- The Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth (MST) First Nations have joined together to form a land holding and development corporation called MST Development Corporation.
- In 2016, the Department of National Defense (DND) sold 38.8 acres on the western-side of the Jericho Lands in Vancouver's Point Grey for \$480 million to the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations.
- Two years earlier, in 2014, MST partnered with Canada Lands Company (CLC), a federal Crown corporation, to buy the 52-acre federal portion on the eastern side of the Jericho Lands for \$237 million.
- The two adjoining properties comprising 90 acres are being developed as one parcel.
- On March 2, 2019, MST Development Corporation launched a 2-year planning process which will deal with a range of issues including height, density, reconciliation, transportation and built form.
- MST Development Corporation and CLC also co-own the Heather Lands, a 21-acre site being developed between West 33rd and 37th avenues at Heather Street, which includes 40 percent affordable housing.

BACKGROUND:

The Minister met with the Musqueam Indian Band during the 2017 and 2018 First Nations Leadership Gatherings. s.16

s.16

Jericho Lands

Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Wauthuth (MST) First Nations have lived on the Jericho Lands for more than three thousand years. The goal of the MST Development Corporation is to recognize the cultural significance of the lands to the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations while transforming these lands into a sustainable new neighbourhood.



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

Vancouver city council approved a policy statement for the Jericho property in May of 2018. The development will include 2,500 new homes, at least 40 percent of which will be designated for low- and moderate-income families. Residential buildings will be from three to 24 storeys. There will also be park space, a childcare facility and a cultural centre.

s.16

DISCUSSION:

s.13; s.16

Attachments:

1. ^{s.13}
2. 2018 FNLG Briefing Note

PREPARED BY:

Carol-Anne Hudson, Senior Policy Analyst
Housing Policy Branch
(778) 974-3886

APPROVED BY:

Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 22, 2019

May 24, 2019



s.13

ATTACHMENT 1:

University Endowment Lands Governance Study

For more than 100 years, the University Endowment Lands (UEL) has been directly administered by the Province.^{s.13; s.16}

s.13; s.16

Ielum (Block F)

The Ielum lands were transferred to the Musqueam for development purposes as part of the 2008 Musqueam Reconciliation, Settlement and Benefits Agreement, which also saw the transfer of Block K and the University Golf Course to the Musqueam. The Province approved rezoning in the UEL for the Ielum development in November 2016. Development is underway and may take 10-12 years to complete. Development will add up to 2,500 residents to the UEL.



FIRST NATIONS LEADERS GATHERING BRIEFING NOTE

Date: November 29, 2018
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: Musqueam Indian Band
Attendees: Chief Wayne Sparrow, Councillor Wendy John
CEO Stephen Lee, CAO Tracy Samra, Associate Director Dianne Sparrow
Issue: University Endowment Lands (UEL)
Pronunciation: mus-kwee-um

SUMMARY:

- **The Musqueam are located in the Fraser Health Authority, in Vancouver near the Point Grey area.**
 - s.16
- **Ministry Contacts:**
 - **For UEL Governance Review: Brent Mueller, Director of Governance Relations.**
Brent.Mueller@gov.bc.ca; 778 698-3220.
 - **For UEL Administration: Jonn Braman, Manager, University Endowment Lands,**
jonn.Braman@gov.bc.ca; (604) 660-1810 X28.

BACKGROUND:

The Musqueam are an independent First Nation located in the Point Grey area of Vancouver. The band population is approximately 1,414 (2018). s.16

The Musqueam traditional land claim area includes the Point Grey Peninsula which comprises the University Endowment Lands (UEL) and the University of British Columbia, within Electoral Area A of the Metro Vancouver Regional District, and parts of the City of Vancouver.

The UEL is unlike any other place in British Columbia (BC); because of its unique history, it is the only urban area in BC not run by a local government but is directly administered by the Province. The Minister is the ultimate lawmaker (e.g. adopts bylaws) and day-to-day administration is the responsibility of a statutory delegate, the UEL Manager. The Province has been acting as the "local government" for the UEL for over 100 years, and while this Provincial-run model made sense historically, with the amount of growth, development and demand for change by residents in this community s.13

s.13



DISCUSSION:

UEL Governance

Rather than the traditional provincial role of providing a modest level of services to a small, stable and self-sufficient resident population, the UEL is now facing a growing number of internal and external pressures; changing demographics; increasing community demand for change; development pressures to multi-family and single-family neighbourhoods, including as leləm (lay-lum, formerly Block F), s.13; s.16

s.13; s.16

s.13; s.16

s.13; s.16

Page 096 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 2, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Building Resilience and Energy Retrofit Consultation Framework

Issue: The Building and Safety Standards Branch is developing a retrofit strategy so that existing buildings can respond to the risks of climate change and other hazards. Stakeholder consultation will be completed between spring 2019 and winter 2020 and will inform the development of policy options for new retrofit codes.

SUMMARY:

- **Stronger energy efficiency codes for existing buildings are a key component of CleanBC and are needed to meet the Province's greenhouse gas reduction targets.**
- **The Building and Safety Standards Branch is developing a Building Resilience and Energy Retrofit Strategy to promote increased energy efficiency and seismic resilience in existing buildings.**
- **The Building and Safety Standards Branch will work with stakeholders to develop policy options to improve energy efficiency in existing buildings and reduce seismic risk to British Columbians and the provincial economy.**
- **The Building Resilience and Energy Retrofit Strategy will also work with stakeholders to identify other opportunities for local governments and the Province to promote resilience in the built environment.**
- **Voluntary energy and seismic retrofit codes will be available in 2022 and become province-wide requirements in 2024.**

BACKGROUND:

CleanBC identifies the development and adoption of an energy code for alterations to existing buildings by 2024 as a key priority. This is essential to meet the Province's greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets of 40 percent below 2007 levels by 2030. Together with stronger codes for new buildings, increased energy efficiency standards for heating equipment and windows, low-carbon building solutions and focused investments in public housing, the commitment for better buildings will reduce GHG emissions from the building sector by 0.5 million tonnes by 2030. The Building and Safety Standards Branch (BSSB) is responsible for the building regulatory aspect of the better buildings commitment.

Existing buildings are a priority because over 70 percent of the buildings that will exist in 2030 are already built. Many of these buildings were constructed before modern energy efficiency standards. These buildings present a significant opportunity for improved energy efficiency and GHG reduction while making buildings more comfortable for occupants and more affordable to operate.

DISCUSSION:

Regulating existing buildings is currently a challenge. The BC Building Code is designed for new construction, which accounts for no more than 3 percent of construction in any year. Application of the BC Building Code to renovations, retrofits and alterations is inconsistent as local governments interpret and enforce the code differently. These inconsistencies arise because standards for new construction are



not always achievable and there is a lack of clarity in the BC Building Code on the scope of upgrade required and when an upgrade may be triggered. BC's renovation industry accounted for \$9.8 billion in investment value in 2017 and this lack of clarity results in a missed opportunity for GHG reductions.

BSSB will leverage its work on energy efficiency in existing buildings to also consider the province's unique seismic and climate risks. Such considerations are critical as the majority of British Columbians live and work in regions that are considered to have a high hazard for earthquake events and are increasingly subject to the effects of a changing climate. For example, a recent seismic assessment completed for the City of Vancouver concluded that the direct impacts to buildings of a 7.3 magnitude earthquake in the Strait of Georgia (a likely scenario) would include over 11,500 people injured, 10 percent of buildings unusable and nearly one-half of residents displaced for more than a month. There would also be significant damage to commercial buildings and businesses affecting the city's economic resilience. Seismic retrofits can mitigate risks for building occupants and enhance structural resilience in buildings before and after a seismic event. There are also opportunities to bundle seismic and energy efficiency retrofits at the time of certain building upgrades. Work on seismic retrofits will also support the modernization of the *Emergency Program Act*.

Existing buildings is a new line of business for BSSB. Developing this new regulatory component will involve three phases of work. Attachment 1 summarizes the project timeline.

Phase 1 – Building Resilience and Energy Retrofit Strategy (2019-2020): BSSB will prepare a strategy that develops technical targets and identifies policy options to support successful regulation of energy and seismic retrofits to existing buildings. The strategy will also develop a resilient buildings lens to identify and prioritize other options for climate risk mitigation and adaptation in the built environment, including the effects of rising sea levels, flooding, forest fires, and extreme weather events. The strategy will focus on complex building types, leaving smaller residential buildings to a separate project to be undertaken at a later date. BSSB will consult with stakeholders throughout the preparation of the strategy. Government will provide direction on a preferred policy option at the conclusion of this phase. The strategy will consider the following:

- Identify triggers for when a building must be retrofitted (e.g., at the time of a building permit, the scope or value of the building permit, re-build after a disaster event, etc.);
- Establish the extent of retrofit (e.g., equipment replacement only, envelope upgrade, etc.);
- Determine whether a new code should be prescriptive or performance-based, allowing greater flexibility on how objectives are met;
- Propose an acceptable level of performance of a retrofitted building relative to new construction;
- Identify strategies to mitigate market and non-market barriers to building retrofits, such as financing tools, incentives, capacity building, education and outreach and other programs and initiatives;
- Identify and prioritize other climate change adaptation and hazard mitigation options for buildings and cities that can be implemented as part of, or in addition to, energy and seismic retrofits; and
- Determine whether local governments have the resources and regulatory tools to promote climate change mitigation and adaptation in the built environment.



The desired outcome of this phase is to ensure that policy options for building retrofits are leveraged to address multiple hazards. This phase will also identify and prioritize future building and land use planning policy work by the Ministry.

Phase 2 – Codes and Standards (2021-2022): BSSB will prepare the technical codes and standards required to implement strategy recommendations. BSSB will also coordinate development of any associated regulations or programs required to support successful implementation.

Phase 3 – Implementation (2022-2024): BSSB will provide for voluntary adoption of the technical codes and standards in 2022 prior to creating a province-wide requirement in 2024. The voluntary adoption period will allow for industry learning and provide an opportunity to adjust regulations, as needed.

No stakeholder consultation has taken place to date. Stakeholder consultation supports the development of informed, effective, and evidence-based policies that are acceptable to the market, while also helping to build support for new regulation. Although consultation may raise concerns about the costs of regulation and potential impacts on affordability, it also provides a forum to learn from stakeholders so that concerns can be addressed and mitigated through policy development.

Stakeholder groups included in the planned consultation are identified in Attachment 1. These include provincial ministries and agencies with a policy interest in existing buildings, public sector organizations responsible for large building portfolios, local governments responsible for implementation and enforcement of codes, Treaty First Nations which are subject to the BC Building Code, residential and commercial building owners and managers, renovation professionals, real estate and planning professionals, and utility companies.

The City of Vancouver is currently preparing strategies to support improved seismic resilience and energy performance in existing buildings. The Capital Regional District and municipalities within the capital region are currently developing a residential retrofit acceleration program. BSSB will work closely with these local governments to deliver mutually reinforcing strategies.

Strategy development will involve three iterations of targeted stakeholder consultation:

Listen and Learn (spring and summer 2019):

The initial phase of consultation will be used to inform stakeholders of the project, develop a shared understanding of the policy problem, and prepare a set of principles to be used as policy evaluation criteria. This phase will involve small group consultations, surveys, and the creation of a working group to provide insight throughout policy development. By the end of this phase stakeholders will be informed of government priorities and have had an opportunity to inform the development of policy options. This phase is not public facing.

Discuss Options (fall 2019 and winter 2020):

The second phase of consultation will be used to solicit input from stakeholders on a series of policy options. The desired outcome of this phase is that stakeholders and Ministry staff develop a shared understanding of options, policy trade offs, and build consensus around policy preferences. An economic analysis of each policy option will be completed. This will consider the economic impact on stakeholders, feasibility and the need for financing options and incentives to promote building upgrades. This phase is not public facing. Recommended options will be brought forward for Government decision at the completion of this phase.



Inform of Selected Option (fall 2020):

The final phase of consultation will inform stakeholders of the option or options directed by Government. The desired outcome of this phase is that stakeholders understand policy decisions and other relevant information such as timelines for implementation. This phase will be public facing and will be jointly developed and executed by BSSB and Government Communications and Public Engagement.

BSSB will begin technical code development following the completion of the strategy. Retrofit codes that local governments can opt into will be available in 2022 before becoming province-wide requirements in 2024.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

None at this time.

Attachments:

1. Project Timeline
2. Stakeholder List

PREPARED BY:

Aman Gill, Senior Policy Analyst
Building and Safety Standards Branch
(778) 584-1815

APPROVED BY:

Gregory Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

April 29, 2019

May 2, 2019

Page 101 of Page 101 MA-2019-95214



ATTACHMENT 2 - Stakeholder List

Internal Stakeholders	Interest
Ministry of Energy Mines and Petroleum Resources (Energy Efficiency Branch)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment of CleanBC policy goals Shared objective to support market transformation towards a low carbon, energy efficient economy Collaboration on elements of stakeholder engagement
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (Climate Action Secretariat)	
Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (Heritage Branch)	
Ministry of Education (Capital Management Branch)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government mandate to invest in retrofits Increased cost of capital replacements Knowledge and skills to support high-performance retrofits
Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training (Capital Asset Management)	
Ministry of Citizens' Services (Asset Management Branch)	
Ministry of Health (Asset Management Branch)	
Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General (Emergency Management BC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seismic resilience and mitigation of risk
Ministry of Jobs, Trade and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic impacts to construction and development industry Opportunities for the provincial clean tech sector
External Stakeholders	Interest
Union of BC Municipalities and Local Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New tools to help achieve BC Climate Action Charter commitments Opportunity for local governments to help implement CleanBC Capacity to enforce new regulations Unpermitted renovations Impact on housing affordability
Treaty First Nations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New tools to help mitigate risks of a changing climate Impact on communities and housing stock Capacity to enforce new regulations
City of Vancouver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonization of provincial policies/regulations with local bylaws Collaboration
Energy Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on demand Fuel switching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC Hydro FortisBC 	



External Stakeholders	Interest
Building Owners/Operators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condominium Home Owners Association • BC Non-Profit Housing Association • Co-operative Housing Federation of BC • BC Housing (Asset Strategies and Energy) • LandlordBC • Building Owners and Managers Association 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost implications • Financing and cost recovery • Clarity on the extent and timing of retrofit • Quality assurance
Real Estate Professionals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC Real Estate Association • Appraisal Institute of BC • Mortgage Brokers • BC Notaries • BC Law Institute • Insurance Bureau of Canada • Insurance Council of BC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on real estate portfolios • Cost and financing implications • Risk mitigation
Renovation/Construction Associations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC Construction Association • Regional Construction Associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to comply with new regulations • Knowledge/training • Unpermitted renovations
Industry Professionals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineers and Geoscientists BC • Architectural Association of BC • Building Officials Association of BC • Interior Designers Institute of BC • Planning Institute of BC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to comply with new regulations • Knowledge/Training • Professional's role
National Code System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes • Provincial Territorial Policy Advisory Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonization of national and provincial codes
National Research Council and Natural Resources Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and collaboration on developing performance targets for existing buildings • Advancing national existing building code development
Leading International Jurisdictions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of San Francisco • City of Los Angeles • New York City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share knowledge on topics such as regulation and implementation tools (i.e., financing, incentives)



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 2, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Affordable Housing Challenges in Tofino

Issue: Finding a non-profit organization with the capacity to operate shelter or supportive housing for vulnerable individuals in Tofino.

Meeting With: Mayor Josie Osborne, District of Tofino and MLA Scott Fraser on May 8, 2019.

SUMMARY:

- **Tofino is facing a severe lack of affordable rental and supportive housing, exacerbated by high land values and a seasonal influx of workers and visitors.**
- **There are some community organizations in Tofino who operate housing but there is limited capacity, and most are specialized in servicing specific client groups. There are also challenges in finding a non-profit with the capacity to operate shelter or supportive housing for vulnerable individuals.**

BACKGROUND:

In May 2018, Josie Osborne was re-elected Mayor, District of Tofino (Tofino) for a third term. She has presented at UBCM on the topic of short-term rentals in 2017 and 2018. Mayor Osborne was part of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's Housing Needs Reports advisory group.

Mayor Osborne is also one of three local government representatives on the provincial Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Advisory Council, which provides strategic advice to government on climate action and clean economic growth under CleanBC.

She will be participating in a session at the upcoming Land Summit in Vancouver on May 10, 2019, with MAH and Climate Action Secretariat staff, on ways to increase local government climate action.

She has also been on the UBCM 2016 and 2017 panels for the short-term rental workshops to discuss impacts of Short Term Rentals on the availability of long-term worker and resident housing in Tofino.

On May 8, the Mayor is meeting with the Honourable Scott Fraser, the MLA for that area and a previous Mayor of Tofino from 1996 to 1999.

Tofino created an Affordable Housing Needs Assessment Report in 2015 based on census data, local community consultations, and an employer/employee survey. The report identified four actions (not prioritized):

1. Supported housing for vulnerable populations;
2. Permanent, year-round rental housing for low- or moderate-income residents;
3. Entry-level home ownership units; and
4. Shared rental accommodation for seasonal non-resident employees.

The Tofino Housing Corporation (THC) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the District of Tofino with a mission to build capacity to develop affordable housing in the community.

Page 105 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16 ; s.17



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

DISCUSSION:

Under the Supportive Housing Fund, BC Housing will lead the creation of these new projects in partnership with non-profit housing providers, government authorities and community groups. Non-profit housing providers are expected to deliver supportive services including meals, supporting residents to maintain their residencies, and individual or group support services such as life skills and employment programs.

There are some non-profits who operate housing in Tofino but there is limited capacity and it is specialized. There are also challenges in finding a non-profits with the capacity to operate shelter or supportive housing for vulnerable individuals. BC Housing will continue to work with Tofino Housing Corporation to seek partnerships with non-profits in Tofino and to build capacity in developing affordable and supportive housing.

Attachments:

s.13; s.16; s.17

PREPARED BY:

Susan Low, Senior Policy Analyst
Housing Policy Branch
(778) 698-1690

APPROVED BY:

Kathy Elder, Acting/Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards
Tara Faganello, Assistant Deputy Minister
Local Government Division

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 3, 2019

May 3, 2019

May 3, 2019

Page 107 of 136 to/à Page 111 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; s.16 ; s.17



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 13, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: *Community Safety Act* Amendments
Issue: s.13

SUMMARY:

s.13

BACKGROUND:

The Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General (PSSG) is proposing amendments to Bill 12 – 2013 *Community Safety Act* (CSA or “the Act”) that will:

- Modernize the Act to address the current community safety needs of British Columbians, including the targeting of activities associated with gang and gun violence;
- Enhance the administrative fairness of the Act; and
- Minimize the administrative burden of the Act.

The CSA was passed by the BC Legislature in 2013 but is not yet in force. It is to be brought into force by regulation. Under the legislation, members of the public may submit confidential complaints to a Director of Community Safety about properties where specified activities are taking place that negatively affect the community. Upon receiving a complaint, the Director can proceed to investigate and take escalating administrative action, including ending tenancy agreements and closing the property for up to 90 days.

Similar legislation exists in six other Canadian jurisdictions, which all report it as effective. The six jurisdictions are: Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Yukon, Nova Scotia, Alberta, and New Brunswick.

s.13

On February 19, 2018, the Cabinet Committee on Social Initiatives gave direction to amend the CSA and consider implementing it in Fall 2019 as a component of the Gang Suppression Action Plan (GSAP). The

s.13



s.13

DISCUSSION:

The amended *Community Safety Act* targets properties used for threatening and disturbing activities that negatively affect communities – many of them linked to gun and gang activity.

The intent of the legislation is to provide another tool to deal with unsafe and disruptive activities that are negatively effecting neighbourhoods and to hold property owners accountable. Specific property uses or activities under the CSA are:

- Unlawful trafficking, use or production of drugs;
- Unlawful sale or purchase of liquor;
- Unlawful use or sale of intoxicating substances;
- Possession or storage of an unlawful firearm, weapon or explosive;
- Commission or promotion of a criminal organization offence, and;
- Aid, assistance, or support to gangs or criminal organizations.

The Director under the Act cannot take action unless a complaint has been made. There is a three-part test in the Act that complaints must meet in order for the Director to take action. The threshold of criteria for action on a complaint is as follows:

1. Is the specified activity occurring on/near a property? (e.g. possession, production, use, trafficking, sale, etc. in contravention of the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*),
 2. Is the specified activity occurring habitually? (i.e. not an isolated incident), and
 3. Is the community or neighbourhood being adversely affected by the activity?
- By adverse affect, this means that:
 - The health, safety or security of one or more persons is affected, or
 - The peaceful enjoyment of the property is affected.

The Director can also take informal action to resolve activity prior to applying for a community safety order. Applying for a Community Safety order is a last resort.

s.13



s.13

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- None

PREPARED BY:

Joshua Gomez, Policy Analyst
Residential Tenancy Branch
(250) 812-9504

APPROVED BY:

Gord Enemark, A/ADM
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 13, 2019

May 13, 2019



BRIEFING NOTE FOR DECISION

Date: May 22, 2019

Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Title: Safety Oversight of Amusement Rides

Issue: Technical Safety BC is proposing that safety oversight of trampoline parks be regulated under the *Safety Standards Act* and the regulation of amusement rides expand from primarily regulating technical equipment to include regulating new amusement experiences and patron behavior.

RECOMMENDED OPTION:

1. Approve in principle the regulation of trampoline parks under the *Safety Standards Act*. Request that Technical Safety BC (TSBC) work with trampoline park owners/operators to investigate non-regulatory measures to develop a culture of safety.

BACKGROUND:

The *Safety Standards Act* - Elevating Devices Safety Regulation - establishes the installation and operational requirements for amusement rides in BC. TSBC is responsible for the safe installation and operation of technical systems and equipment and administers the Amusement Devices Safety Program. Since 2015, TSBC has planned to review and amend the Elevating Devices Safety Regulation. Potential enhancements include refreshing the definition of amusement rides to clarify and expand rides, devices, or experiences included and excluded and replacing the out-dated *Safety Code for Amusement Rides and Devices* with a more recent technical standard, which includes an improved scope of defined technologies.

Following several reports of serious injuries sustained by children and the tragic fatality of a man at a trampoline park in January 2018, the Ministry of Health, Vancouver Coastal Health, the Union of BC Municipalities, the Extreme Air Park in Richmond, and concerned parents asked the Province to establish regulatory oversight for trampoline parks. There are approximately 15 trampoline parks operating in BC.

Over the past year, TSBC led a comprehensive review to determine whether trampoline parks should be regulated and to inform recommendations to the Province regarding safety oversight of amusement rides and devices. Key components of their assessment include: convening advisory panels of industry experts and government partners, conducting a jurisdictional scan of national and international regulatory frameworks and best practices, seeking legal recommendations to inform guiding principles, and engaging with related regulators, park owners/operators, the insurance industry, and members of the public. See Attachment 1 for the list of advisory panel representatives.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (the Ministry) acknowledges the specialized and comprehensive effort undertaken by TSBC in conducting the amusement device review to date.

DISCUSSION:

The scope of amusement rides is expanding beyond the typical rides offered at the Pacific National Exhibition. With the emergence of new extreme experiences designed for public amusement and thrill-seekers, with varying levels of risk, it is important patrons are aware of the risks, follow the rules, and practice safe behaviors to create a culture of safety. Within the context of amusement devices, regulatory oversight of trampoline parks is the most pressing concern.

Page 116 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.13

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- None.

OPTIONS:

s.13



Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

s.13

RECOMMENDATION:

- Option 1.

APPROVED (Option 1) / NOT APPROVED

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Selina Robinson", written over a horizontal line.

Honourable Selina Robinson

May 28, 2019

Date

Attachments:

1. Advisory Panel Representatives
2. Proposed Regulatory Principles

Ministry of
Municipal Affairs
and Housing

PREPARED BY:

Shannon Laboucane, Policy Analyst
Building and Safety Standards Branch
(778) 974-3912

APPROVED BY:

Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kathryn Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

Gord Enemark OBO
May 21, 2019

May 21, 2019



ATTACHMENT 1: Advisory Panel Representatives
Government Advisory Panel

Organization	Title	Name
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Director, Safety Policy	Shannon Horner
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Policy Analyst	Shannon Laboucane
Ministry of Health	Executive Director, Healthy Living and Health Promotion	Johnathon Robinson
Ministry of Health	Senior Policy Analyst	Linda Phillips
Technical Standards and Safety Authority (Ontario), Elevating and Amusement Devices	Director	Roger Neat
Technical Standards and Safety Authority (Ontario), Elevating and Amusement Devices	Supervisor	Sunny Silva
Technical Safety Authority of Saskatchewan	Manager	Robin Santos
Vancouver Island Health Authority	Medical Health Officer	Dr. Murray Fyfe
Vancouver Coastal Health	Medical Health Officer	Dr. Meena Dawar
Vancouver Coastal Health	Senior Medical Health Officer & Regional Injury Prevention Lead	Dr. John Carsley
Vancouver Coastal Health	Director, Environmental Health	Steve Chong
Vancouver Coastal Health	Senior Environmental Health Officer	Richard Taki
JTL Group (Insurance Broker)	VP Corporate-Sports	Sandy Millar
Markel International (Insurance Company)	VP Western Region Leader	Gina Bennett
Coroner's Office	Deputy Chief Coroner	Vincent Stancato



Industry Advisory Panel

Organization	Title	Name
Ryerson University Tools for Holistic Ride Inspection Learning and Leadership Laboratory	Director and Certified Professional Ergonomist	Professor Kathryn Woodcock
Alberta Elevating Devices, Amusement Rides and Safety Association	Manager of Safety Services	Dean McKernon
Sun Peaks Recreation Area	Lift Maintenance Manager	Dean Roberts
Vancouver Coastal Health	Medical Health Officer	Emily Newhouse
Sypher & Associates Field Engineering		Cindy Sypher
City of North Vancouver	Coordinator – Community Services	Juliana Buitenhuis
Dynamic Attractions	VP, Technical Services	David Lo
Pacific National Exhibition	Manager, Playland Maintenance and Ride Operations	Shawn Joinson



ATTACHMENT 2: Technical Safety BC's Proposed Regulatory Principles

A principles-based approach is intended to be one that can be nimble and adapt as more and different kinds of amusement rides are developed as technology changes.

The developed principles are:

- **The nature of the ride or device and its use should be a threshold for the decision to regulate it.** A ride or device that is public, is offered for a fee, and that is used for amusement should be regulated by Technical Safety BC or another authority.
- **The safety gap should be a threshold for regulation.** Technical Safety BC should regulate amusement rides where a safety gap exists because no other regulators provide oversight, and where there is a code or standard that can be applied to work and equipment.
- **The risk posed to riders guides regulation.** The nature and level of risk posed to riders from the technology should be considered. As the level of risk increases, the need to regulate increases.
- **The control a patron has over their experience guides regulation.** Rides with less patron control carry an increased expectation of safety as patrons cannot self-limit their exposure to risk. As patron control decreases, the need to regulate increases.
- **The safety contribution that Technical Safety BC can make guides regulation.** The reasonable ability of regulatory activity to increase safety and mitigate unacceptable risk to an acceptable level guides the kind of regulatory tools that can be employed. At extremes, no regulatory activity can improve safety (extremely risky or extremely safe rides) without considerable or impractical resource requirements.



BRIEFING NOTE FOR INFORMATION

Date: May 24, 2019
Prepared For: Honourable Selina Robinson, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Title: North Shore Homelessness and Homelessness Encampments
Meeting With: Bowinn Ma, Parliamentary Secretary on May 27, 2019.

SUMMARY:

- s.12; s.13
- The 2017 Homeless Count reported a total of 102 people experiencing homelessness on the North Shore however the North Shore Homelessness Task Force believes this is a significant undercount.
- According to local outreach teams, there are around 150 people, that they know of, in more than 35 small encampments on the North Shore. Many are in RVs, vehicles, camping in the woods, and/or some are working and thus may not be receptive to outreach services.
- Homelessness in small encampments is an increasing issue in many rural areas around the Province, including the North Shore-West Vancouver- Squamish, Cowichan Valley, Fraser Valley and Thompson-Nicola regions.
- Connecting with people in these small encampments can be challenging because they are often physically isolated and may not be accessing services for homelessness.
- Housing outreach teams are actively engaged on the North Shore, BC Housing is working with North Shore municipalities to explore options regarding homeless/at risk of homelessness populations.
- Ministry staff are developing resources for cross-ministry coordination in response to homeless encampments, in collaboration with BC Housing and the Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction. This includes coordinating outreach responses.
- s.13
- On the North Shore, BC Housing funds emergency shelter beds, extreme weather response beds, outreach services and transitional housing for women and children fleeing violence.
- s.13
- BC Housing has four new housing projects for low income families underway on the North Shore.



BACKGROUND:

Homeless Counts and Outreach

The 2017 Metro Vancouver Homelessness Count identified 102 people experiencing homelessness on the North Shore. This point-in-time count is likely an undercount that did not capture people experiencing homelessness in encampments as 81 percent of those surveyed were sheltered (in shelters, extreme weather shelters, or had no fixed address but were in jails, detox centres or medical facilities).

The count (included in the 2018 provincial count) found homelessness had increased in all BC communities since 2014 except on the North Shore. The North Shore represented about 3 percent of BC individuals experiencing homelessness, with:

- 10 unsheltered & sheltered Indigenous/Aboriginal People experiencing homelessness
- 81 sheltered adults and unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness, and 8 sheltered, accompanied children experiencing homelessness
- 11 unsheltered adults and unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness

A 2018 Youth Homelessness Count identified 64 youth experiencing homelessness on the North Shore (compared with just 12 in the 2017 count), 9 percent of the region's total and making the North Shore the community with the third-highest number of homeless youth.

BC Housing helps fund the Lookout Society for outreach and shelter assistance on the North Shore. This includes an outreach team that connects with people experiencing homelessness in public places and in forested areas, ravines and other places. According to the Lookout Society, there are about 150 people in small encampments around North Vancouver, the North Shore and West Vancouver. Several are in RVs and vehicles and many are working. Outreach teams are able to refer people to shelter and housing resources, including rent supplements as available.

From August 2018 to March 2019, outreach took part in the federal Ministry of Employment, Workforce Development, and Labour pilot program to count and connect with individuals living in the North Shore forests.

The "Deep Woods Program":

- covered the area from Deep Cove to Pemberton
- funded staff from Lookout to work alongside forestry and by-law workers to connect with people living in the North Shore forests
- found many people living in campers and vehicles
- found that almost half of the individuals are employed

s.13; s.16

The Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction (SDPR) community services also provides income assistance outreach to the North Shore and works with the local health authority. They are aware of about 35 small encampments and several people living in RV/campers that move regularly throughout Lynn Valley, Upper Mosquito Creek, Westview and in industrial parks around the North Shore auto mall (bottom of Fell Avenue).



North Shore Shelter and Housing

North Vancouver has one 56-bed year-round shelter and 20 extreme weather shelter beds funded mostly through BC Housing. It also has a youth safe house which also serves seniors at risk of homelessness, and a women's transition house. Emergency shelter and Extreme Weather Response shelters funded through BC Housing are typically full, indicating a high need for service on the North Shore.

Shelter Summary for North Vancouver: Occupancy for January 1st to April 24th, 2019

Type of Shelter	Shelter Name	Shelter Address	BCH Funded Bed #	Occupancy % Funded Beds	Occupancy Active Beds	Notes
Year-Round Shelters	North Shore Shelter	705 West 2nd St.	46	102%	N/A	10 additional beds
EWR Shelters	EWR North Shore Extreme Weather Shelter	705 West 2nd St.	20	76%	76%	Closed as of 13 March 2019

s.13

In addition, BC Housing also subsidizes housing either directly managed by BC Housing or through non-profit partners and provides rental assistance in the private market. As of March 31, 2019, almost 3,000 individuals and households were benefiting from BC Housing programs. A summary of subsidized housing units in North Vancouver, as of March 31, 2019, is attached.

Other housing projects include two *Building BC: Community Housing Fund* developments in North Vancouver: A \$10.6-million project with the Kiwanis North Shore Housing Society to build 106 units of affordable housing for individuals and families and a \$9-million project with Sanford Affordable Housing and Hollyburn Family Services Society to build 90 units of affordable housing for individuals and families.

BC Housing new construction projects for low-income families in North Vancouver are listed in the table below:

Date Announced	Status	Housing Provider	Project Name/ Address	Unit Count
2018-11-13	Initiated	Kiwanis North Shore Housing Society	2555 Whiteley Court	106
n/a	s.13; s.16			
n/a	Under Construction	YWCA	YWCA/ Chard Development 1441 St. Georges Ave	14
				268

s.13; s.16



In addition to the 200 incremental modular units funded in Budget 2019 to address homelessness, initiatives to address homelessness were also taken in the two previous budgets. Budget 2017 Update: The Rapid Response to Homelessness initiative to immediately build 2,000 units of modular supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness. These units are to be completed in Summer/Fall 2019. Budget 2018: The 30-Point Plan for Housing Affordability (30-Point Plan) includes funding for 2,500 new units of supportive housing for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness.

s.13; s.16

DISCUSSION:

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing continues to lead the response to homeless encampments for the Province. Ministry staff monitor encampments and help coordinate requests for assistance from local governments and other ministries. BC Housing leads the operational housing and encampment management responses, liaising with other service ministries, local governments, health authorities and non-profits.

s.13

The Homelessness Action Plan was released as part of the SDPR Poverty Reduction Strategy in Budget 2019
s.13; s.17

Outreach Assistance:

BC Housing and SDPR can refer outreach teams to any encampment location to help with housing, income assistance and other supports.

Please refer local organizations and community members to the BC Housing website at bchousing.org to connect with outreach service providers and for a list of available shelters.



s.13

Outreach services in the province are planned to expand in the coming months. In June, SDPR will launch its new Community Integration Specialist outreach support program – with dedicated outreach for the North Shore. s.13

s.13

Housing Assistance:

There may be further opportunities through Budget 2018's Supportive and Indigenous Housing Funds and Budget 2019's supportive modular housing to establish much-needed housing and supports on the North Shore. For information on these programs, please contact:

- Naomi Brunemeyer, Director, Regional Development Vancouver Coastal and Fraser Regions, at 604 456-8849 or nbrunemeyer@bchousing.org
- Michael Sadler, Director, Indigenous Relations, at 604-306-7074 or msadler@bchousing.org

BC Housing and Ministry staff also have resources for local governments, non-profits and community organizations to respond to community resistance to social housing.

Attachment:

1. Housing supply and demand dashboard for North Vancouver, BC Housing Research Centre

PREPARED BY:

Sarah Petrescu, Senior Policy Analyst
Housing Policy Branch
(250) 812-7885

Nicole Stinson, Senior Advisor
BC Housing
(604) 439-4197

APPROVED BY:

Greg Steves, Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

Kaye Krishna, Deputy Minister

DATE APPROVED:

May 24, 2019

Page 128 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

Copyright

Page 129 of 136 to/à Page 130 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

s.13 ; Copyright

Page 131 of 136 to/à Page 132 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

Copyright

Page 133 of 136 to/à Page 136 of 136

Withheld pursuant to/removed as

DUPLICATE