



**A Review of Current Service Delivery
Arrangements and Issues Related to
Governance in the Interlakes Area
of the Cariboo Regional District**

Prepared for: Cariboo Regional District
Prepared by: Circle Square Solutions Ltd.

December 31, 2015

Table of Contents

1. Introduction, including a brief summary of local government in British Columbia and its application to the Interlakes area.
2. Executive Summary, including a summary of recommendations.
3. Current service delivery and governance arrangements, including a description of regional district decision-making processes for those services.
4. Discussion and analysis of community interests, needs and concerns as expressed through public engagement with residents, property owners and the Regional District, including identification of practical methods to address needs and concerns.

1. Introduction

Earlier in 2015 the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development provided a grant of \$10,000 to the Cariboo Regional District (CRD) for a review of current service delivery arrangements and issues related to governance in the Interlakes area of the CRD. The request for the study was initiated by the Interlakes Economic Association.

George Abbott (a former minister of Community, Aboriginal and Women's Services) and Circle Square Solutions Ltd (including Dale Wall and Bob de Faye, both former deputy ministers responsible for local government) were retained as consultants to undertake the study.

The aim of the study is provision of factual information for the community and the regional district about the existing local government system by:

- documenting the current service delivery and governance arrangements;
- itemizing the interests, needs and concerns of the community;
- describing how decisions are made by the regional district for each of the local government services received; and
- engaging residents, property owners and the regional district in the identification of practical methods to address issues that may arise.

Public engagement was facilitated by a visit from George Abbott to the Interlakes area on October 14, 2015. George met with a range of individuals and parties (including the Interlakes Economic Association) in private sessions during the morning and afternoon. During the evening (7:00 to 9:30 pm), well over 200 local residents attended an open house style meeting which featured a lively exchange of views and perspectives.

A second open house meeting, again chaired by Director Brian Coakley, was held on December 16th with an estimated 150 residents in attendance. George reviewed the content and recommendations of his interim report and enjoyed constructive feedback from the assembled residents. All meetings were held in the Interlakes Community Hall and the respectful expression of sometimes differing perspectives was much appreciated.

Public engagement was a vital component in preparing a final report for the CRD. The report provides an independent review and recommendations pursuant to the itemized aims noted earlier in this section.

The Circle Square Solutions (CSS) team is very appreciative of the knowledge, insight and wisdom which was provided to us during this project. In particular we wish to thank:

- Chair Al Richmond, Area L Director Brian Coakley, CAO Janis Bell, and Corporate Officer Alice Johnston of the CRD for their organizational support;
- the Interlakes Economic Association for their extensive submission;
- the many residents of the Interlakes area who came out to attend our public meetings; and,
- Marsha Jarred who generously offered to record and transcribe the views expressed during the first meeting.

As described in greater detail below, the Interlakes area is obviously home to a range of competing and sometimes conflicting views with respect to land-use planning and development, economic development, and local service needs. The respectful and constructive expression of those views was much appreciated.

A Brief Summary of Local Government in British Columbia

The local government system in British Columbia is primarily comprised of 162 municipalities and 27 regional districts.

Municipalities

There are 162 municipalities in B.C. Municipalities range in population size from small villages of fewer than 250 persons to large cities approaching 600,000 in population.

Municipalities cover only 1% of British Columbia's terrain they provide services to approximately 87% of the provincial population. Municipalities in B.C range in geographic size from 60 hectares to 155,000 hectares.

Municipal councils are democratically elected bodies and are accountable to their electorate. Councils are comprised of a mayor and councillors. Council size varies from five to nine members depending on the population of the municipality.

Municipalities, along with non-municipal areas (known as electoral areas) form part of the regional district system. Municipal councils appoint one or more members to sit as municipal representatives on their respective regional board. This requirement to wear "two hats" is a unique and challenging aspect of the local government system in B.C.

Municipalities operate primarily under the *Community Charter* which recognizes them as an independent order of government within their jurisdiction. This recognition is unique in Canada and enables municipalities to provide a wide variety of services that are reflective of their community's needs and desires.

Municipalities have flexibility in their ability to generate revenue finance operations. This is done primarily through the property tax system but includes the ability to charge fees for services.

The provincial government is responsible for the legislative framework for local government including the legislated process for changing boundaries and incorporating municipalities.

Regional Districts

The boundaries of the regional districts are large and span nearly the entire geographic area of the province. Each regional district is divided into smaller areas called electoral areas. Regional districts are modeled as a federation composed of municipalities and electoral areas, each of which has representation on the regional board.

The governance of regional districts is managed by a board of directors composed of appointees from municipalities and a director elected from each electoral area. The municipal directors serve on the regional board until council decides to change the appointment. The directors from the electoral areas serve for a four-year term.

Regional districts have three basic roles. They provide a political and administrative framework for:

- providing region-wide services such as emergency 9-1-1 services;
- providing inter-municipal or sub-regional services such as recreation facilities where residents of a municipality and residents in areas outside the municipality benefit from the service; and,
- acting as the general local government for the electoral areas and providing local services such as fire protection to unincorporated communities within the electoral areas.

Revenue used to finance regional district operations and services is generated through property taxes, fees and other charges. Unlike municipalities, regional districts are required to match the benefits and costs of its services to the people that benefit from the services. In other words, residents pay for the services they receive.

As local governments for unincorporated electoral areas, the responsibilities of regional districts vary from those in municipal areas in some important ways:

- rural road and subdivision services are provided by the provincial government through the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. As with provincial highways, road maintenance is provided through the highway maintenance contractor. Costs are partially recovered through a province-wide property tax on property in rural areas. The rate is constant across BC but varies across property classes. Any costs not covered by property tax are funded through other components of provincial general revenue.
- Policing is provided by the R.C.M.P. through the provincial policing contract with the R.C.M.P. Costs are partially covered through a provincial policing tax that varies by area and property class. Any costs not covered by the property are funded through other components of provincial general revenue.
- K-12 education is the responsibility of the Cariboo-Chilcotin School District which operates within a financial envelope provided by the provincial government through the Ministry of Education. Provincial property taxes partially recover the costs of school services. The remainder of school costs are funded through other components of provincial general revenue.
- Regional district services are budgeted and financed on a service- specific basis as opposed to a bundle-of-service approach in municipalities. In regional district budgeting, each service has a specific budget, a specific defined service area, and a specific cost recovery structure. Funds cannot flow from one service to another.

Details with respect to service provision within the Cariboo Regional District are provided below in section 3 of this report.

2. Executive Summary

Based on what George Abbott heard at the October 14th and December 16th, 2015 public meetings and our review of current governance arrangements, we are pleased to provide the following recommendations for consideration by the Cariboo Regional District:

Recommendation #1: That the CRD administration, in consultation with the Area L Director and local residents, attempt to identify an enhanced communication strategy.

Effective communication can be a significant challenge in rural areas of regional districts. Some areas are not directly served by community newspapers and, in the absence of broadly-available internet services, attempting to connect with all taxpayers in a timely way can be very challenging.

Recommendation #2: That an incorporation study not be pursued at this time.

An incorporation study is a far broader and deeper exercise than the governance review undertaken here. Considerable work must be undertaken before the Province might contemplate the funding of an incorporation; it is never a step that is undertaken lightly or precipitously. Years of debate, study and deliberation precede a public referendum on the question.

There appears to be a broad consensus that now is not the time to further consider incorporation for the Interlakes area. Although there is some frustration with the limitations around local control that exist within the regional district model, there is also broad recognition that municipal status requires a tax base that is extensive and sufficiently concentrated to carry the cost of local roads and other services.

Recommendation #3: That the CRD be respectfully requested to give highest priority to an updating of the Interlakes Official Community Plan (OCP) in 2016.

There appears to be a strong community consensus around the need to update the Interlakes OCP, now close to a dozen years old. An update is scheduled for 2016.

The CRD can expect to hear a range of competing and sometimes conflicting visions of community development during the OCP process. Such differences of opinion are both welcome in a democratic society and useful in the generation of an updated OCP. To ensure the process is effective, the CRD and the Area L Director should consider the creation of a representative local committee to provide preliminary assessment of potential reforms.

Recommendation #4: That the CRD explore the potential opportunities for infrastructure funding to bring enhanced IT/ internet/broadband service into the Interlakes area, subject to consultations confirming local interest.

There appears to be a strong consensus in support of enhanced IT/internet/broadband services among residents of the Interlakes. Improved access will create capacity for current and prospective residents to carry on business activities and contribute to economic development. This enthusiasm is also likely shared by seasonal residents accustomed to unlimited access in their city homes.

The CRD should work to find funding partners and opportunities. These could include the federal and provincial governments and the Northern Development Initiative Trust. Use of existing federal gas tax funding could also be considered.

Recommendation #5: That the CRD welcome and await the advice of the Cariboo Chilcotin Coast Tourism Association with respect to an enhanced model of tourism funding, planning, development and promotion.

Tourism is experiencing a period of substantial and hopefully constructive change, reflected most prominently in the provincial initiative creating Destination BC. Even more recently, Destination BC announced on September 15, 2015 the launch of an “enhanced Municipal and Regional District Tax” (MRDT), a program which allows a tax of up to 3% on short-term accommodation in participating areas. Participation is dependent on a voluntary opt-in among applicable businesses. Should MRDT be utilized, revenues would be devoted to tourism marketing and programs in all participating sub-regions of the Cariboo Chilcotin Coast Tourism Association (CCCTA). The CCCTA is leading early discussions and analysis of potential use of MRDT.

Recommendation #6: Tourism operators in the Interlakes should work with the local M.L.A. to shape the provincial commitment to update the *Tourism Accommodation (Assessment Relief) Act* in a way that works to reduce business tax levels in the Interlakes.

The provincial government is committed to updating the *Tourism Accommodation (Assessment Relief) Act* in its current mandate. While this could reduce business class property taxes from tourism operators in the Interlakes, it is a complex decision for the provincial government as it has financial and tax implications for many local governments, businesses and citizens. The fact that the government has committed to such a change during its current mandate represents a real opportunity but it will take sustained work on the part of supporting local governments to find a practical way forward.

Tourism development and promotion is a specialized area of expertise well beyond the expertise of the authors of this document. We know that tourism is today one of the mainstays of the economy in the Interlakes area and that it can be a “green and clean” industry in one of the most beautiful and unspoiled areas of BC. We believe that subject to local leadership and support, the CRD can assist in maximizing the opportunities which tourism can generate in the area.

Recommendation #7: The CRD should carefully consider a review of cost sharing and cost recovery formulas to determine if there are ways to better align tax levels with services received and ability to pay.

Area L, which includes the Interlakes contains about 7 per cent of the population of the CRD and about 11 per cent of the total population of all electoral area. However, because of relatively high property values – associated largely with lakefront properties – it represents about 14 per cent of total CRD assessed value and 20 per cent of electoral area value. As a result, the use of assessed value as a means of cost sharing for region wide and electoral area wide services does mean that Area L consistently pays more than a per capita share for services received.

Whether assessed value is appropriate in the funding of particular services is a complex question. Assessed value is by far the most common means of funding regional district services around B.C.; in a much smaller number of cases regional districts – including the CRD -- have taken some action to mitigate the effect by using improvement only taxes and parcel taxes for some services. In this context, it is worthwhile to consider whether

additional actions to alter cost sharing and cost recovery formulas may be merited, while recognizing that there are no easy answers here.

Recommendation #8: As part of the Official Community Plan update (or as a separate initiative) the CRD consider, in consultation with the community, whether a new or expanded service for amenities like trails, lake accesses or the Bridge Lake ice caves could be developed both to benefit local residents and to act to draw tourism. If such a service is created the CRD should advocate for grant funding towards its development.

There is strong support, but no obvious consensus, around whether additional public amenities such as trails, lake accesses or public management of the Bridge Lake Ice caves should be pursued. The proposed OCP update is a possible venue for the community to strive to reach consensus on these questions.

If such a direction is pursued it opens an additional avenue (in addition to high speed network connectivity) by which grant funding could be deployed to the Interlakes. This is an important aspect of an equitable sharing of grant funding given that the most common services to receive grant funding - water or sewer - are not present in the Interlakes.

Recommendation #9: The CRD should work with the Cariboo-Chilcotin Board of Education to explore creative ways to see if it is practical to maintain an operating school in the Interlakes, including complementary community uses of the school building and associated cost-sharing.

The CRD Board has recently and constructively resolved to engage the Cariboo-Chilcotin Board of Education on community impacts of potential school closures. Among the elements that might be engaged in that discussion are complementary community uses of the school building as well as early learning programs for children in the area such as Strong Start and (if student numbers permit) Kindergarten.

Recommendation #10: The Official Community Plan update process referenced in recommendation #3 should be designed in a way that enables community residents to work at reconciling differing visions for the future community, find points of common ground and provide ways of advancing those areas of commonality.

The community that expressed itself at the October public meeting was one in which there were obvious and substantive divisions. Work on a new community plan is possibly the best venue for seeking to at least partially reconcile these differing visions and find some points of common ground. This means that the OCP process will need to be carefully designed with this goal in mind.

Recommendation #11: That, through a combination of local consultation and comparative analysis of practices and approaches in other jurisdictions, the CRD assess the feasibility of expanded summer openings of landfill/recycling facilities in the Interlakes area.

Summer demand for seven-day-a-week landfill access is a common challenge among regional districts with tourism-generated volumes in conjunction with relatively limited tax bases. One potential solution may be an expansion of summer hours offset by reduced service hours in quieter seasons, but this would require much more consideration and consultation.

3. Current governance and service delivery arrangements

The purpose of this section is to describe governance and current service in the Interlakes area, located in the south central part of the Cariboo Regional District.

Governance

As in all parts of British Columbia the governance of the Interlakes area is provided through a mixture of federal, provincial and local governments.

The primary local governance unit is the Cariboo Regional District (CRD). The CRD, like all of B.C.'s 28 regional districts is created under and works within the terms of the *Local Government Act*. It consists of 4 municipalities (Quesnel, Williams Lake, 100 Mile House and Wells) and 12 electoral areas (A-L).

Regional Districts are structured as modified ward governments. This means that each jurisdiction elects a representative to represent it on the board. In municipal areas the municipal council appoints the municipal representatives to the Board (although municipalities do have the ability to enable these representatives to be elected by their citizens).

In non-municipal areas such as Interlakes, the citizens of the electoral area directly elect each director. As a result, one Director represents each jurisdiction within the regional district on the Board. Interlakes is part of area L and is represented on the regional board by the Area L Director.

In terms of regional district voting arrangements, there are four important things to keep in mind:

1. Most regional district votes will be on the basis of one director one vote.
2. Money votes are taken on the basis of a weighted vote, with those directors representing areas with a greater population having a greater number of votes.
3. Where only some areas participate in a service votes only those directors representing participating areas will vote, unless there is only one director for the service area in which case the full board votes.
4. When a service is established consent of the participating area is required – this comes either in the form of consent from a municipal council or consent of the electors through a referendum or alternative approval process, in a non-municipal area.

Table 1 sets out the structure of the Cariboo Regional District.

Structure of Cariboo Regional District				
Jurisdictions	2014 Population	Number of Directors	Voting Strength	
City of Quesnel	10,007	1	5	
City of Williams Lake	10,832	1	5	
District of 100 Mile House	1,886	1	1	
District of Wells	245	1	1	
Electoral Area A	6,375	1	3	
Electoral Area B	4,006	1	2	
Electoral Area C	1,225	1	1	
Electoral Area D	3,132	1	2	
Electoral Area E	4,637	1	2	
Electoral Area F	4,791	1	2	
Electoral Area G	4,960	1	2	
Electoral Area H	1,798	1	1	
Electoral Area I	1,708	1	1	
Electoral Area J	1,325	1	1	
Electoral Area K	1,288	1	1	
Electoral Area L	4,177	1	2	
Total	62,392	16	32	

Like all regional districts, the Cariboo Regional District is able to customize services to fit the scale and scope which it determines best fits the needs of its citizens. As a result, services may be delivered on a region-wide basis, only to electoral areas, only to some participants (either municipalities or electoral areas) or to defined service areas representing part of an electoral area. In the Interlakes all of these approaches are used.

Table 2 shows the proportion of total population and assessment represented by each jurisdiction in the regional district.

Table 2

Distribution of Cariboo Regional District Population and Assessment Across Jurisdictions

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>2014 Population</u>			<u>2013 Assessment</u>		
	#	% of total	% of Total Electoral Area Population	\$'s millions	% of Total	% of Total Electoral Area Value
City of Quesnel	10,087	16.0		923	12.7	
City of Williams Lake	10,832	17.4		1,080	14.8	
District of 100 Mile House	1,886	3.0		229	3.1	
District of Wells	245	0.4		15	0.2	
Electoral Area A	6,375	10.2	16.2	584	8.0	11.6
Electoral Area B	4,006	6.4	10.2	423	5.8	8.4
Electoral Area C	1,225	1.9	3.1	109	1.5	2.2
Electoral Area D	3,132	5.0	7.9	408	5.6	8.1
Electoral Area E	4,637	7.4	11.8	378	5.2	7.5
Electoral Area F	4,791	7.7	12.2	683	9.4	13.6
Electoral Area G	4,960	7.9	12.6	790	10.9	15.7
Electoral Area H	1,798	2.9	4.5	295	4.1	5.9
Electoral Area I	1,708	2.7	4.3	129	1.8	2.5
Electoral Area J	1,325	2.1	3.3	128	1.8	2.5
Electoral Area K	1,288	2.0	3.3	55	0.7	1.1
Electoral Area L	4,177	6.7	10.6	1,051	14.4	20.9

Total	62,392	99.7		7,279	100
Total Electoral Area	39,422		100	5,033	100

Service Provision

Services

As with all unincorporated areas local government services are provided directly by the provincial government or by the local regional district.

In the case of the Interlakes up to two thirds of the tax bill is represented by provincial services, which are beyond the reach of the CRD to change with the remainder within CRD control. (Note: this percentage distribution is influenced by the working of the provincial homeowner grant and will be different for different property values). Some of these are broad region wide services which are cost shared with other parts of the region and some are specific local services, such as the local volunteer fire department.

Provincial Services

- Roads (\$57.00/\$100,000) - Highway 24, rural roads and subdivision services are provided by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure. Road maintenance is provided under the highway maintenance contract with Interior Roads Ltd. for the South Cariboo area. Annual cost of the contract for the whole of the South Cariboo area was reported as \$12,754,459 when it was initiated in 2004. It is subject to annual updates for inflation and changes to highway infrastructure. A rural area tax, at rates, which vary between each of 9 property classes but which are consistent throughout the province, is imposed by the provincial government to recover costs. In 2014 the residential rate was \$57/\$100,000 of assessed value.

In a municipal context, ownership and responsibility for local roads is vested in the municipality. The rural area tax no longer applies and the municipality includes the cost for road maintenance, rehabilitation and new construction in its annual budget and property tax rate.

- Subdivisions - Subdivision includes the creation of two or more parcels from one original parcel, as well as adjusting or consolidating existing property lines. Subdivision within the CRD is under the authority of the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MOTI). Subdivision applications are made through FrontCounter BC. The legal

context for subdivision approval is the provincial *Land Title Act*. Subdivisions must generally conform to existing Official Community Plans and zoning bylaws.

In a municipal context responsibility for subdivision approval would rest with the municipality. The legal framework would continue to be the *Land Title Act*.

- Policing (\$14.50/\$100,000) - Policing is provided by the R.C.M.P. under the provincial policing contract. A rural area tax is imposed by the provincial government to recover costs. Rates vary by area and property class. In the Interlakes area the 2014 residential rate is \$14.50/\$1,000 in assessed value.

In a municipal context this arrangement would remain the same, so long as the municipality had a population of less than 5,000. At populations above 5,000 responsibility for R.C.M.P. costs would shift to the municipality, at a cost determined by formulas set out under the global contract B.C. has with the R.C.M.P. Generally municipal costs increase during the transition when their population increases beyond 5,000.

- Property Assessment – Property assessment is provided by B.C. Assessment. Costs are covered by a province wide property tax that varies between the 9 classes of property but where each rate is constant throughout the province.

In a municipal context there would be no change to the governance and provision of assessment services.

Education – Cariboo-Chilcotin Board of Education/Province of B.C

- K-12 education is the responsibility of the Cariboo-Chilcotin School District, which operates within a financial envelope provided by the provincial Ministry of Education. The Cariboo-Chilcotin School District covers a large, diverse area with the distance between the most eastern school and the most western school estimated at over 500 km.

The School District provides education to approximately 5,200 students in 24 schools in communities, which range from a few families to one serving over 30,000 people. The three smallest schools have less than 20 students while the largest has just under 1,500.

The Board of Education of School District No. 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin) is composed of seven trustees, representing all regions of the large district. As a Board, they are responsible to the communities and to the Provincial Government for providing educational services throughout the district. The schools' principals and vice-principals are responsible for planning and implementing school programs suitable to the needs of their communities.

Provincial school property taxes partially recover the costs of school services. In the Interlakes the residential school tax is \$320/\$100,000. These school taxes are partially offset by the provincial homeowner grant, which in the Interlakes area is \$770 (\$1,045 for seniors

and eligible persons with disabilities). It fully eliminates school taxes on residential properties of less than about \$240,000 (about \$325,000 for seniors and eligible persons with disabilities) and reduces school tax levels for properties of greater value. At lower values a portion of the grant is used to reduce non-school property taxes, subject to a minimum tax payment of \$350.

In a municipal context, arrangements for the governance and provision of K-12 education would not change.

Cariboo Regional District Services

- A number of services are provided through the Cariboo Regional District. The overall tax rate for these services is around \$270/\$100,000 though that may vary depending on location and the composition of property). The largest costs are for fire protection which is provided through community based volunteer fire departments and for solid waste services which conform to a provincially mandated solid waste plan. Table 3 summarizes the full set of local government services and tax amounts per \$100,000 in assessed value. Table 4 then shows the region wide or sub-regional budget for those services provided through the Cariboo Regional District as well as the portion attributable to Area L, of which the Interlakes is a part.

It should be noted that in a regional context “services” are legally established under an establishing bylaw that has received local consent and which sets out the nature of the service, the participants and the basis on which costs are shared between participants.

Here is a service-by-service description of regional district services to the Interlakes. The figures in brackets are the property tax/\$100,000 of assessed value associated with the service.

- Administration (\$33.66/\$100,000) - this is broken up into 4 services – Regional Administration, shared between all regional district members (all municipalities and electoral areas) Electoral Area Administration, shared only between electoral areas on the basis that these equate to costs that are internalized with municipalities, Governance (all municipalities and electoral areas) and a specific service for costs unique to Electoral Area L. Costs for the two shared services are apportioned on the basis of assessed values. Table 4 provides the actual 2014 costs.
- Bylaw Enforcement (\$3.05/\$100,000) - the bylaw enforcement service is provided to all electoral areas with cost apportioned between electoral areas using the property base.

Bylaw Enforcement actively enforces the following bylaws:

- Cariboo Regional District Zoning and Rural Land Use Bylaws;

- Cariboo Regional District Untidy and Unsightly Premises Bylaw;
- Cariboo Regional District Building Bylaw;
- Cariboo Regional District Noise Bylaw

Assistance is also provided in enforcement of:

- Cariboo Regional District Solid Waste Disposal Regulation; and the,
 - Invasive Plants Bylaw.
- Electoral Area Emergency Planning (\$1.20/\$100,000) - this service is provided to all electoral areas and apportioned on the basis of the property tax base.
 - 911 (\$7.48/\$100,000)- the 911 service is provided to entire regional district with costs apportioned between all electoral areas and member municipalities;
 - Area L Grants for Assistance (\$25.25/\$100,000) - grants for assistance are discretionary funds that the Regional District may choose to provide to community groups to assist in the costs of improving community facilities, holding special events, etc., that are believed to be of value to the residents of the electoral area.
 - Heritage (\$0.08/\$100,000) - supports the work of the volunteer regional heritage committee which has created products such as a regional heritage driving tour guide and map.
 - Invasive Plant Management (\$2.32/\$100,000) - supports the control of invasive plants in a number of ways including providing various forms of assistance (such as equipment loans) to private landowners
 - Land Use Planning (\$4.94/\$100,000) - is provided to all electoral areas including area L. Costs are apportioned using the property tax base. Only directors of jurisdictions who participate in the service can vote on planning decisions. In the Cariboo Regional District, this means that electoral area directors vote on rural area planning decisions.

The Cariboo Regional Districts planning service provides long-term and current planning services to works to unincorporated areas of the Cariboo Regional District.

The long-range planning component includes the research and development of land use policies and regulations. Land use policies are adopted as official community plans, and land use regulations are adopted as zoning bylaws.

- Official Community Plans

Official community plans are policy documents intended to provide future direction

for land use decisions. Any land use initiative must be consistent with these plans. In the non-municipal part of the Cariboo Regional District, there are currently seven Official Community Plans:

- [South Cariboo Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [Interlakes Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [Lac La-Hache Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [150 Mile House Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [Quesnel Fringe Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [Green Lake & Area Official Community Plan;](#)
- [Williams Lake Fringe Area Official Community Plan;](#)

- Zoning

The entire Cariboo Regional District is covered by either a zoning or rural land use bylaw. Development of land must be in accordance with the provisions and regulations of the zoning bylaw. If a change in land use of property is contemplated, a rezoning application may be required. If the land is also within an official community plan area, applications to amend both the official plan and the zoning bylaw may be required.

- Development Permits

Land lying within the area covered by an Official Community Plan or rural land use bylaw may be subject to development permits. These permits relate primarily to the character of development, and can include matters such as exterior design and finishing of buildings, protection of the natural environment or addressing hazardous condition or site development matters such as site layout, drainage and servicing.

The current planning component includes the processing of current development-related applications.

- Building Inspection- (\$5.73/\$100,000) the building inspection service is provided to defined portions of Electoral Areas A,B, C, E, F and I and all of Electoral Areas D, G, H and L, with costs apportioned using the property tax base.

The Building Inspection service provides building inspection services as set out in the building bylaw for residents and builders. Building inspection services are provided to assist residents and builders in constructing projects, which meet minimum construction standards.

Responsibilities associated with the Cariboo Regional District Building Inspection service include:

- providing a detailed plan review service, and the issuance of building permits;
- providing building and plumbing inspections as laid out in the building bylaw;
- issuing permits for wood-burning appliances and inspections to confirm safe installations;
- responding to public enquiries relating to construction standards and regulations; and,
- ensuring that projects reviewed and approved by the building inspection department comply with the zoning and land use bylaws of the Cariboo Regional District.

Cariboo Regional District building inspectors are located in Williams Lake and 100 Mile House. Service in the Quesnel area is delivered by City staff under a contractual arrangement.

- South Cariboo Economic Development/Tourism Promotion (\$4.16/\$100,000) - this service is provided to Areas G/H and L. Tourism promotion is provided through a contract with the 100 Mile Development Corporation. Provision is also made for a sani-dump to service travelers with recreational vehicles and for a mobile stage to support event delivery, both of which are to support tourism development. Costs apportioned between them on the basis of the property tax base;
- South Cariboo Regional Airport (\$10.50/\$100,000) - this service is provided to Electoral Areas G/H/L and 100 Mile House with costs apportioned between them on the basis of the property tax base.

The Cariboo Regional District's South Cariboo Regional Airport serves the South Cariboo area from 108 Mile Ranch. It is a year-round airport with an asphalt runway that has a total length of 5,293 ft. and a width of 75 ft. In 2014, the airport had a total of 2,482 plane arrivals and departures; 68 of these were medevacs.

The airport is owned by the Cariboo Regional District and operated under contract by Nick's Rag and Tube. The contractor is responsible for the maintenance of the airport. The contractor reports to the South Cariboo Regional Commission, which is responsible for overseeing the airport and which includes representation from the three southern Electoral Areas, "G", "H" and "L", and the District of 100 Mile House.

- Solid Waste Disposal/Rural Refuse - (\$58.13 or \$44.95/\$100,000 of assessed value depending on service). The Interlakes is primarily covered by the rural refuse service. The Cariboo Regional District (CRD) operates 14 landfills and 18 transfer stations throughout the region to provide solid waste disposal facilities for its residents. These facilities accept household garbage, and many accept scrap metal and appliances, wood waste, and demolition material. The CRD also works with its four member municipalities and the Recycling Council of British Columbia for delivery of recycling programs.

- Solid Waste Planning (\$0.12/ \$100,000 of assessed value);
- Under the *Environmental Management Act*, every regional district is required to have a Solid Waste Management Plan that has been approved by the Ministry of Environment, and updated every 10 years. The purpose of these plans is to identify programs and strategies by which local governments can target waste reduction objectives.
- The current CRD plan received ministerial approval in April 2013. It provides for the long-term management of municipal solid waste in an environmentally and economically - acceptable manner. The plan will be phased in over a 10-year period, which began in 2013; priority was given to implementation of hauling efficiencies and controlling the busiest sites.
- The plan is being implemented through a cooperative effort involving the Cariboo Regional District, member municipalities, the BC Ministry of Environment, and where applicable, private enterprise. Plan funding will be achieved through grant funding, general taxation and user fees.
- Under the new Solid Waste Management Plan, costs for disposal of average amounts of residential waste will continue to be covered through taxation and not from tipping fees. Commercial waste and above average/large loads of residential waste will be charged tipping fees. For tipping fee schedules and descriptions of waste types refer to the Tipping Fee section in the side bar.
- Library - (\$30.70/\$100,000 of assessed value of improvements only). In municipalities, this service is financed on the basis of land and improvements value.
- Fire Protection - Deka Lake (\$112.68/\$100,000)/ Interlakes (\$37.78/\$100,000 of improvements + 47.77/parcel)

Note: These are defined service areas so costs are recovered from taxpayers within the service area. There is no cost sharing.

The Cariboo Regional District currently administers 14 volunteer fire departments throughout the region.

They are:

- Deka Lake,
- Lac La-Hache,
- Wildwood,
- Bouchie Lake,
- Lone Butte,

- 150 Mile House,
- Kersley,
- Barlow Creek
- Forest Grove,
- Miocene,
- West Fraser,
- Ten Mile Lake
- 108 Mile Ranch; and
- Interlakes

Two of these – Interlakes and Deka Lake are in the Interlakes area.

The Insurance Advisory Organization recognizes all volunteer fire departments operated by the Cariboo Regional District for insurance purposes.

The Cariboo Regional District has established mutual aid agreements between fire departments, which encourages a cooperative approach to maximizing the level of service provided to constituents. The agreements allow equipment and manpower from departments to assist neighbouring fire departments in the case of large fires or concurrent incidents.

Mutual aid agreements are also in place with the three municipal fire departments: the District of 100 Mile House, the City of Williams Lake, and the City of Quesnel, as well as with several independent and First Nations fire departments.

- Search and Rescue (\$1.01/\$100,000) - contribution agreement to support the search and rescue group.
- Feasibility and rural feasibility but they both currently have no requisition (though some years they do).
- Area L Community Halls – parcel tax of \$10.34 to support three community halls within the electoral area.

These arrangements are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3
Services and Rates

Service	Land and Improvement Tax/\$100,000 Property (\$'s)	Improvement Only Tax/\$100,000 (\$'s)	Parcel Tax (\$'s)
Provincial General (roads)	57.00		
Provincial Police Tax	14.50		
Provincial School	320.00		
BC Assessment	5.96		
Regional Hospital	71.54		
Cariboo Regional District - Area L			
• Area L Directors Administration	1.00		
• General Administration	11.26		
• CRD Governance	1.48		
• Electoral Area Administration	19.97		
• Bylaw Enforcement	3.05		
• Electoral Area Emergency Planning	1.21		
• 911	7.48		
• Area L Grants for Assistance	25.25		
• Heritage	0.08		
• Invasive Plant Management	2.32		
• Planning	4.94		
• Building Inspection	5.73		
• South Cariboo Economic Development	4.16		
• South Cariboo Regional Airport	10.5		
• Solid Waste Management Planning	0.12		

• South Cariboo Solid Waste Management	44.95 or 58.01		
• Library		26.34	
• Area L Halls			10.34
• Fire			
○ Deka	112.68		
○ Interlakes		37.78	47.77
• Search and Rescue	1.01		
Total	737.56	64.12	58.11
Less Homeowner Grant – \$770/\$1045			
Minimum Tax \$350			

Table 4
Cost of Services

Cariboo Regional District Services	Total Cost (\$'s)	Cost Attributable to Area L (\$'s)	Area L Share (%)	Participants
Area L Directors Administration	1,086	1,086	100	Area L
General Administration	1,148,064	124,793	10.9	All CRD
CRD Governance	145,819	15,850	10.9	All CRD
Electoral Area Administration	1,322,225	222,704	16.8	All EA's
Bylaw Enforcement	201,690	34,016	16.8	All EA's
Electoral Area Emergency Planning	80,000	13,475	16.8	All EA's
911	762,681	82,902	10.9	All CRD
Area L Grants for Assistance	27,325	27,325	100	Area L
Heritage	5000	842	16.8	All EA's
Invasive Plant Management	192,258	25,829	13.4	All but
Planning	402,480	67,789	16.8	All EA's
Building Inspection	235,600	NA		All but defined areas (see page 18)
South Cariboo Economic Development	62,500	27,512	44.0	Areas G/H/L
South Cariboo Regional Airport	200,143	75,822	37.8	Areas G/H/L and 100 Mile House
Solid Waste Planning	12,668	1,377	10.9	All CRD
South Cariboo Solid Waste Management	803,512	NA		Defined Area of G/H/L and 100 Mile House

Rural Refuse	602,831	NA		All but defined areas of G/H/L
Library	2,209,993	47,950	2.2	All CRD
Area L Halls	54,580	54,580		Area L
Fire				Defined Areas
• Deka	144,060	144,060		
• Interlakes	214,610	214,610		
Search and Rescue	5,000	NA		H/L and part of G
Total				

5. Community interests, needs and concerns as expressed in engagement sessions

What We Heard, Analysis and Recommendations

During the course of our interviews and discussions, and in correspondence received after the public meetings at Interlakes Community Hall on October 14th and December 16th, we heard many thoughtful and constructive ideas and suggestions for improving both local services and, more broadly, quality of life in the area.

The ideas and suggestions expressed were not always compatible or complementary; such differences of opinion are not uncommon in a healthy democracy and we have attempted to record those differences without bias or value judgements. There is no “right” or “wrong” vision for community development; those kinds of choices reside in the realm of local politics. We have not attached names to the views expressed as, in some cases, anonymity was requested; we have not attempted to identify the number of respondents holding particular points of view. As noted at the first public meeting, our interest is qualitative rather than quantitative.

Our aim is to provide a factually-accurate analysis of what we heard, supplemented by knowledge of practices and processes in other regional districts or comparable local governments. We also aim to keep our recommendations within the realm of the possible and practical.

(a) Does the Relationship with CRD need improvement? What we heard:

“CRD is geographically too large, and the electoral areas are too large”

“The Interlakes area is not properly served by any newspaper. The CRD must communicate with taxpayers using many different methods of push notifications.”

“I am very happy with the CRD and its delivery of our governance and service delivery. I believe that if it's not broken don't fix it.”

“In addition to being rural and somewhat remote, several communities in Area L are highly seasonal. No amount of posters will reach these distance taxpayers.”

“Residents are not convinced they are getting their money’s worth for a high tax burden.”

“The CRD’s newsletter could be much more informative than it is and deal with issues we are facing or asking residents for input on matters affecting them”

“Most people are generally happy with the way the CRD acts: people are generally independent-minded who enjoy this area for what it is”

“CRD needs more modes of communication”

“Signboards should be installed at solid waste sites”

“Despite the cost, more use needs to be made of snail mail to push substantive info to full-time and seasonal residents”

“There may be times when the CRD needs feedback from the residents in a timely manner, so the solution needs to address two-way communication as well”

Analysis:

Effective communication can be a significant challenge in rural areas of regional districts. Some areas are not directly served by community newspapers and, in the absence of broadly-available internet services, attempting to connect with all taxpayers in a timely way can be very challenging.

Some respondents specifically suggested the addition of regularly maintained and managed notice boards at widely-used public locations like recycling/refuse sites. The use of posters in strategic public locations can be a very useful outreach tool but may need to be supplemented in other ways.

The CRD currently produces a semi-annual newsletter which covers the region and services provided. This newsletter is undoubtedly beneficial and informative, but the CRD might also consider appending area-specific (or sub-regional) information bulletins to regular mail notices such as annual tax bills. Alternatively, the newsletter itself might be sub-regionalized with area-specific content. Such bulletins might potentially be used to canvass public opinion on potential future projects.

Further, Director Coakley advised meeting attendees that he will be implementing an Area L electronic outreach to complement CRD web-based information services.

In short, there is no single answer to the challenge of communication in CRD (or other regional districts that face the same challenge). As suggested by respondents, multiple but complementary modes of communication (such as regular mail, e-mail, bulletin boards, and newspaper ads/releases) may hold the greatest promise of success.

Recommendation:

#1. That the CRD administration, in consultation with the Area L Director and local residents, attempt to identify an enhanced communication strategy.

(b) Should Incorporation be considered? What we heard:

“If we decide to incorporate how do you sort out the process? What are the formulas? What are the joint functions?”

“This is not an incorporation meeting”

“Area L is not a unified community by any definition and would make a poor candidate for incorporation at this time”

“We are not in favour of incorporating. We haven’t got a good tax base”

Analysis:

An incorporation study is a far broader and deeper exercise than the governance review undertaken here. Considerable work must be undertaken before the Province might contemplate the funding of an incorporation study; it is never a step that is undertaken lightly or precipitously. Years of debate, study and deliberation precede a public referendum on the question.

There appears to be a broad consensus that now is not the time to further consider incorporation for the Interlakes area. Although there is some frustration with the limitations around local control that exist within the regional district model, there is also broad recognition that municipal status requires a tax base that is extensive and sufficiently concentrated to carry the cost of local roads and other services.

Recommendation:

#2. That an incorporation study not be pursued at this time.

(c) Is it time to update the Interlakes Official Community Plan? What we heard:

“Our OCP is old and out-of-date”

“The current OCP is twelve years old and offers no potential for commercial or industrial growth”

“The CRD should consider the intensity of land use applications, as well as the age of the OCP, and give priority to Area L for 2016”

“Does CRD plan an OCP update for 2016?”

“OCP needs to reflect our rural character”

“The current OCP is more than 5 years out of date, and in much need of revision”

Analysis:

There appears to be a strong community consensus around the need to update the Interlakes OCP, now close to a dozen years old. An update is scheduled for 2016, but some respondents expressed the concern that the Interlakes OCP may be set back due to even older plans existing in other areas of the CRD. Should that possibility arise, respondents made the case that the higher volume of land-use applications in the Interlakes area should make its OCP work a CRD priority.

As further noted in subsection (k) below, the CRD can expect to hear a range of competing and sometimes conflicting visions of community development during the OCP process. Such differences of opinion are both welcome in a democratic society and useful in the generation of an updated OCP. However, to ensure the process is effective, the CRD and the Area L Director might consider the creation of a representative local committee to provide preliminary assessment of potential reforms.

Recommendation:

#3. That the CRD be respectfully requested to give highest priority to an updating of the Interlakes OCP in 2016.

(d) Should CRD look at expanding IT/internet services? What we heard:

"Internet access here is spotty, unpredictable and expensive"

"I had unlimited internet access in Kamloops but it costs me a fortune here"

"If small communities got together and recognized that access to high speed internet was a need, then this need might be realized"

"What we need is an IT plan"

"Has the BC Connect opportunity been lost?"

Analysis:

There appears to be a strong consensus in support of enhanced IT/internet/broadband services among residents of the Interlakes. Improved access will create capacity for current and prospective residents to carry on business activities and contribute to economic development. This enthusiasm is also likely shared by seasonal residents accustomed to unlimited access in their city homes.

The biggest questions are: what will it cost? Are there programs that can be accessed for the service? Can costs be reduced by grants from funding organizations, federal gas tax revenue, or even potentially a new federal infrastructure program? The new federal government has promised major infrastructure investment over the next three years as stimulus spending and will be predictably looking for ready partners and opportunities.

Recommendation:

#4. That the CRD explore the potential opportunities for infrastructure funding to bring enhanced IT/ internet/broadband service into the Interlakes area, subject to consultations confirming local interest

(e) What could the CRD do to further enhance tourism? What we heard:

"We need a tourism plan...We are trying to develop a tourism industry which is green and clean"

“There’s been a shift in Destinations BC funding and direction and I don’t know where we fit in the emerging vision”

“We should look at the [tourism industry surcharge] for this area as a funding mechanism for tourism promotion”

“Tourism is growing elsewhere but not here”

“Is there a model for tourism planning, development and promotion that would give Interlakes – including the Fishing Highway Tourist Association – a strong voice within the broader region?”

Analysis:

Tourism is experiencing a period of substantial and hopefully constructive change, reflected most prominently in the provincial initiative creating Destination BC. Even more recently, Destination BC announced on September 15, 2015 the launch of an “enhanced Municipal and Regional District Tax” (MRDT), a program which allows a tax of up to 3% on short-term accommodation in participating areas. Participation is dependent on a voluntary opt-in among applicable businesses. Should MRDT be utilized, revenues would be devoted to tourism marketing and programs in all participating sub-regions of the Cariboo Chilcotin Coast Tourism Association (CCCTA). The CCCTA is leading early discussions and analysis of potential use of MRDT.

Tourism development and promotion is a specialized area of expertise well beyond the experience of the authors of this document. We know that tourism is today one of the mainstays of the economy in the Interlakes area and that it can be a “green and clean” industry in one of the most beautiful and unspoiled areas of BC. We believe that subject to local leadership and support, the CRD can assist in maximizing the opportunities which tourism can generate in the area.

We also believe it would be premature to recommend a specific tourism planning model while CCTA work is ongoing; the outcome of their discussions may help define a future model that provides participants with, as one respondent noted above, “a strong voice within the broader region.”

The provincial government is also committed to updating the *Tourism Accommodation (Assessment Relief) Act* in its current mandate. While this could reduce business class property taxes from tourism operators in the Interlakes, it is a complex decision for the provincial government as it has financial and tax implications for many local governments, businesses and citizens. The fact that the government has committed to

such a change during its current mandate represents a real opportunity but it will take sustained work on the part of supporting local governments to find a practical way forward. Discussions of TAARA have not borne fruit to date but, given that the Act remains in place, it may yet come into play as change proceeds.

Recommendations:

#5. That the CRD welcome and await the advice of the Cariboo Chilcotin Coast Tourism Association with respect to an enhanced model of tourism funding, planning, development and promotion.

#6. Tourism operators in the Interlakes area should work with the local M.L.A. to shape the provincial commitment to update the *Tourism Accommodation (Assessment Relief) Act* in a way that works to reduce business tax levels in the Interlakes.

(f) Is there a mismatch between CRD taxation and services rendered? What we heard:

“There are 12 electoral areas, but our area ends up paying 20% of the costs”

“I pay the same taxes here as I did in New Westminster, but without city services”

“The CRD carries forward a surplus year-to-year averaging 84 % in the services it provides for us”

“As taxpayers, we don’t feel that the CRD should be carrying surpluses”

“Our overall impression is that the CRD is doing a reasonable job of delivering services”

“The CRD has done a pretty good job of keeping taxes relatively low but providing a range of services”

“There is always room for improvement. If the CRD can re-arrange budgets to accommodate improvements....great!”

Analysis:

Area L, which includes the Interlakes, contains about 7 per cent of the population of the CRD and about 11 per cent of the total population of all electoral area. However, because of relatively high property values – associated largely with lakefront properties

– it represents about 14 per cent of total CRD assessed value and 20 per cent of electoral area value. As a result, the use of assessed value as a means of cost sharing for region wide and electoral area wide services does mean that Area L consistently pays more than a per capita share for services received.

Whether assessed value is appropriate in the funding of particular services is a complex question. Assessed value is by far the most common means of funding regional district services around B.C.; in a much smaller number of cases, regional districts – including the CRD -- have taken some action to mitigate the effect by using improvement only taxes and parcel taxes for some services. In this context, it is worthwhile to consider whether additional actions to alter cost sharing and cost recovery formulas may be merited, while recognizing that there are no easy answers here.

Recommendation:

#7. The CRD should carefully consider a review of cost sharing and cost recovery formulas to determine if there are ways in which reduced reliance on land and improvement values might improve alignment of tax levels with services received and ability to pay.

- (g) Should the CRD consider a new or expanded service function for local amenities like halls, walking trails or lake accesses? What we heard:

“We are a small community with limited volunteers, no paid staff, no income to hire an individual to run programming, therefore groups must organize themselves and we supply the centre for their use”

“I know how favourably the community reacted to the ice caves trails, and am absolutely certain that any extension/improvement of the existing trails around our area would be welcomed”

“Public accesses to lakes have grown over and are effectively inaccessible; so too are hundreds of kilometres of trails. We need a plan of action and a program for management”

“A plan for hiking and biking trails would be a real plus for both residents and tourism. We could get to awesome places like the ice caves”

“Without planning, you can’t identify projects; without identifying projects there will be no funds allocated and without funding dedicated by the CRD there is no opportunity for

infrastructure grant applications. Planning processes bring residents and the business community together....”

“The ice caves are a local treasure that too few tourists and residents ever get to visit and enjoy”

“The CRD must work with organizations to use their direct grants in a way that allows for the piggy backing on other grants. This will require advanced planning with community organizations and more flexibility in funding timing”

Analysis:

There is very considerable support, but no obvious consensus, around whether additional public amenities such as trails, lake accesses or public management of the Bridge Lake Ice caves should be pursued. The proposed OCP update is a possible venue for the community to strive to reach consensus on this question. If such a direction is pursued it opens an additional avenue (in addition to high speed network connectivity) by which grant funding could be deployed to the Interlakes. This is an important aspect of an equitable sharing of grant funding given that the most common public services to receive grant funding - water or sewer - are not present in the Interlakes.

There may be models of trail development and maintenance elsewhere in the province which the CRD might assess for use in Area L or more broadly. For example, the Columbia Shuswap Regional District has over several years forged a successful partnership with the Shuswap Trail Alliance for construction and maintenance of an extensive trail system. With CSRD support, the Alliance has accessed federal and provincial grants for these purposes.

Recommendation:

#8. As part of the Official Community Plan update (or as a separate initiative) the CRD consider, in consultation with the community, whether a new or expanded service for amenities such as trails, lake accesses or the Bridge Lake ice caves could be developed both to benefit local residents and to act to draw tourism. If such a service is created the CRD should advocate for grant funding towards its development.

(h) Is there anything CRD can do to keep the local school open? What we heard:

“We want our children to attend a school that is close at hand...we need more young people with school-age children”

“The majority of our taxes go to education, yet we only have a few students in our school and it may even close”

“With only 5 or 6 students left, our kids may be facing a very long commute to other schools”

Analysis:

The CRD Board has recently and constructively resolved to engage the Cariboo-Chilcotin Board of Education (CCBE) on community impacts of potential school closures. Also noteworthy is that one of the community libraries funded by the CRD is located in the Bridge Lake elementary school, a facility which helps the school stay open and defray costs.

Some community respondents suggested that although elementary student numbers had obviously declined, there was also now a substantial number of pre-school children in the area. The authors are not able to confirm this suggestion, nor are we privy to budgetary and educational planning challenges facing the CCBE. However, given public support for the school as a community hub, among the elements that might be engaged in the CRD-CCBE discussion are complementary community uses of the school building as well as (provided appropriate student numbers exist) programs for early learning such as Strong Start and Kindergarten.

Recommendation:

9. The CRD should work with the Cariboo-Chilcotin Board of Education to explore creative ways to maintain an operating school in the Interlakes, including complementary community uses of the school building and associated cost-sharing.

- (i) Can competing and conflicting community visions be reconciled? What we heard:

“This is a retirement community (not one that is looking to promote manufacturing or mining) and we need to look at what services we require to suit our needs”

“Many people are still looking for affordable recreational lots in our area. The OCP and development regulations ought to make that possible”

“People like the way things are”

“The OCP needs more provision for commercial activities; we can’t grow otherwise”

“We have a common goal, and that is to get more for our tax dollars”

“This is a great community and we should work together”

“There is a divide between those promoting commercial enterprise and those seeking solitude in the area”

“Tourists and seasonal residents have much in common when it comes to preserving and protecting natural resources of the Interlakes area.”

“Development should be focused around 100 Mile House and tourism in Area L should provide maximum visitor satisfaction.”

“Some act inappropriately towards dissenting opinions”

“We like the rural/recreational feel of our area”

“Primary assets of the Cariboo have long been the aesthetics and amenities of its natural environment and the rural way of life that accompanies these”

“I moved to the Cariboo in 1975 for its rural nature, wilderness beauty and pristine lakes”

Analysis:

The community that expressed itself at the October public meeting was one in which there were obvious and substantive divisions. Work on a new community plan is possibly the best venue for seeking to at least partially resolve these differing visions and find some points of common ground. This means that the OCP process will need to be carefully designed with this goal in mind.

Recommendation:

#10. The Official Community Plan update process referenced in recommendation #3 should be designed in a way that enables community residents to work at reconciling differing visions for the future community, find points of common ground and provide ways of advancing those areas of commonality.

- (j) Could operational hours and practices of the recycling/solid waste management site be adjusted to better meet the needs of tourism businesses? What we heard:

“During the summer months a one day a week closure of the refuse site poses a big problem for our business”

“Some of our businesses have been instructed to haul our commercially-generated cardboard to 100 Mile and that just makes no sense from a net environmental perspective”

“The Interlakes landfill needs to stay open 7 days a week in the summer, without raising taxes....we are a tourism area which needs to have different rules/regulations and opening hours”

Analysis:

Summer demand for seven-day-a-week landfill access is a common challenge among regional districts with tourism-generated volumes in conjunction with relatively limited tax bases. One potential solution may be an expansion of summer hours offset by reduced service hours in quieter seasons, but we know far too little about site-specific needs and issues of the Interlakes area to suggest a particular remedy.

Recommendation:

#11. That, through a combination of local consultation and comparative analysis of practices and approaches in other jurisdictions, the CRD assess the feasibility of expanded summer openings of landfill/recycling facilities in the Interlakes area.