

Board Meeting

MAR 11 2021

CCRD ITEM A)(a)



Central Coast

REGIONAL DISTRICT

That we may be good people together

DRAFT SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

DATE: February 25, 2021

ATTENTION

These minutes are draft and subject to amendment. Final Approval and adoption is by resolution at the next scheduled meeting.

The Mission of the Central Coast Regional District is to foster the sustainable socioeconomic and environmental well-being of the Central Coast through the professional and efficient delivery of mandated regional and community services.

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES – February 25, 2021 via videoconference

In Attendance:	Electoral Area A Electoral Area B Electoral Area C Electoral Area D	Director Daniel Bertrand Director Travis Hall Vice Chair Jayme Kennedy Director Lawrence Northeast
Absent:	Electoral Area E	Chair Samuel Schooner
Staff:	Chief Administrative Officer Recording Secretary Operations Manager Finance Manager Contractor Executive Assistant	Courtney Kirk Evangeline Hanuse Ken McIlwain (portion) Ye-Ne Byun (portion) Donna Mikkelson (portion) Destiny Mack (portion)
Delegations:	Elizabeth Howard & Rachelle Beveridge Todd Baker	Food Security Steering Committee Morrison & Hershfield

PART I – INTRODUCTION

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Kennedy called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. and acknowledged the meeting was taking place on the unceded traditional territories of the Nuxalk Nation, Heiltsuk Nation and Wuikinuxv Nation and respective First Nations Territories in which CCRD provides services.

2. Adoption of Agenda

21-02-01 M/S Directors Northeast/Bertrand THAT the Agenda be adopted as amended by adding deferred land use referrals from the February 10-11, 2021 meeting, and the Area D Report. **CARRIED**

3. Disclosures of Financial Interest

The Chair reminded Board Members of the requirements of Sections 100(2) (b) and 101(1) (2) and (3) of the *Community Charter* to disclose any financial interests during the meeting when the matter is discussed. The declaration under this section requires that the nature of the interest must be disclosed. Consequently, a member who has made a declaration must not preside, participate in, or be present during any discussion or decision-making procedure relating to the subject matter which is being discussed.

No disclosures of financial interests were made.

4. Disclosures of Interests Affecting Impartiality.

The Chair reminded Board Members that in the interest of good governance where there is a perceived interest that may affect their impartiality in consideration of a matter a declaration should be made. This declaration does not restrict any right to participate in or be present during the decision-making procedure.

No disclosures affecting impartiality were made.

PART II – PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1. Delegations

a. Elizabeth Howard & Rachelle Beveridge – Bella Coola Food Security Steering Committee

Vice Chair Kennedy welcomed Ms. Howard and Ms. Beveridge of the Bella Coola Food Security Steering Committee to the meeting.

Ms. Howard and Ms. Beveridge presented to the Board as follows:

Ms. Howard thanked the Board for allowing the presentation. Ms. Howard conveyed that she and Ms. Beveridge are members of the Bella Coola Food Security Steering Committee and they would like to speak to the possibility of a community food security survey in Bella Coola. They had originally heard of the idea from Jess Housty in Bella Bella and were inspired by that work.

The Steering Committee has been together since the early spring which Ms. Howard pulled together as a Public Health Dietician, which is contracted through Vancouver Coastal Health. The goal of the group was to check-in weekly that people weren't falling through the gaps in accessing food. Another goal was to create a Food Charter. One way to start is by gathering data.

Food security is a determinant of health and has been a core public health program in BC since 2006. Food security is also declared a Tier 1 priority issue requiring immediate cross-sectoral action by the Provincial Health Officer in 2020. This was in direct response to the food insecurities that were exposed since the pandemic started.

When the Committee looked at a food security continuum, most of the funding made available went to food banks and meal programming. The Agricultural Society programming around food security has to include capacity building. The Society looked more at community gardens, community kitchens, and also social enterprise. The Society is also looking at commercial kitchens and product development. The Steering Committee is looking more forward than that. Efforts have been made at looking at systems-change and looking specifically at food charters and food policy.

Food charters can be local/regional in scope. If you think about a strategic plan, a food charter is a mission statement. It reflects the core values of a community and how they want

their food system to look. When we talk about food policy, it includes all levels of government. Canada will be creating a national food policy. In terms of a strategic plan, the food policy is the objectives and action items and holds accountability for implementing the policy.

The way to get to a food charter or policy that reflects the region that it's standing for is to collect data. The Steering Committee hopes to implement the survey to increase awareness and understanding of food related issues in the valley which will lead to increased community participation. This of course enhances community capacity. It will also give the Steering Committee social licence to move towards a food secure valley. With the data the Steering Committee can develop stronger networks and partnerships. Ms. Howard hopes it will affect positive change in public policy.

Ms. Beveridge notes that she became involved in this project with a few different hats, including one as the Director of the Agricultural Society. Ms. Beveridge is also working with Nuxalk Health on long-term food resilience planning. She knows that through Nuxalk Health there are plans to conduct a food security survey for the Nuxalk Nation. Kitasoo/Xai'xais is also doing a food security survey as well. Up and down the coast this is happening because COVID-19 has highlighted vulnerabilities.

In working with Kirsten Tallio to develop a Nuxalk survey, thoughts have arisen of questions that might be asked in Bella Coola or regionally, depending on how CCRD wants to be involved.

Questions the Steering Committee survey will be asking about include things like household food security, what kind of access do people have to local foods, food distribution, what kind of capacity do we have for food production, how are emergencies affecting access to food, and what kinds of resources are required in terms of infrastructure.

The benefits to the CCRD are that the survey could inform the Official Community Plan and emergency preparedness planning; it also aligns with economic development and food production and processing. There is intersection around land use planning, building bio regional relationships, and being a partner in food charter or policy work that comes of this initial survey.

What can the CCRD do? How would you like to see this move forward? Would the CCRD like to assist with some of the logistics around the survey, review survey questions, add questions, provide data collection boxes throughout community, promote survey on website and social media, support dissemination of survey results or offer financial support? Understandably there may not be a lot of money available.

The mandate for this survey came from the Steering Committee which has membership from all different groups involved in food security in the valley here. The Steering Committee envisions the CCRD and Agricultural Society being partners in this survey. Ms. Howard would take the lead using funds from her Public Health Dietician role. Ms. Beveridge is also interested in making sure the project is successful, though remains uncertain whether any

remuneration can be made available through a partnering institution for her services. The results of the survey would go to official partners and to the public.

The Board thanked the delegates for the concise information provided. The Board noted that Ms. Beveridge and Ms. Howard have pointed out areas of overlap and what would be of interest to the CCRD. The Board further noted that Director Northeast attended a CCRD led housing needs engagement session and it was noted that in the valley there is a need for market housing, subsidized housing and rental accommodations. If we are going to address the particular need of housing, the first question that will arise is land use. There will be many questions around the matter of land use. The Board voiced support of the concept in principal, but further noted CCRD's constraint of capacity and resources.

The Board also noted that the discussion is timely. The Board clarified that in terms of the housing needs assessment, the provincial government awarded the CCRD with nearly \$100,000 to take on that initiative, as the requirement is provincially driven, and the project is a significant undertaking for the organization and still underway. If there were grant funds to look at a food security survey and assessment, there would be better ability to assist. The CCRD is limited in resources and staffing. This would be important to look at to see if there is money available or how the strategic plan can be adjusted to look at food security.

The Board also noted the geography of the entire region and opined that ideally a survey would be extended to all communities. In Bella Bella there is currently food distribution to elders through a volunteer society, led by the Qqs Projects Society. The Board opined that there needs to be more people involved in producing their own food as well, which will strengthen food security issues in Area B. With COVID-19, a lot of individuals started producing their own food. Traditional trading routes can be incorporated into this as well. In future the Board noted enthusiasm in seeing solutions to funding gaps as this is an important topic.

Ms. Beveridge noted that there is a really big pot of federal money for local food infrastructure that's focused on regional food systems. By collecting data, that will highlight that there's local discernable interest and political will in bolstering the food system, a need for food chillers, and a need for a refrigerated truck. To have hard data to back an application for regional infrastructure would be helpful.

Ms. Howard mentioned that the Steering Committee has expanded and includes the outer coast with the goal of having a bio regional network and possibly a policy that extends to the whole region.

The Board highlighted that Grant in Aid applications are open. The Bella Coola Agricultural Society may be eligible to apply. Money is given every year to various non profits throughout the region. The Board cautioned that last year Qqs Projects Society applied for a grant for food security for \$2,500 and the Board decided to award them only \$1,500, so there may not be strong support financially through Grant in Aid. The applications for Grant in Aid are due March 1, 2021.

Ms. Beveridge noted interest in submitting two applications this year if possible to Grant in Aid. CAO Kirk advised Administration would go through technical questions about Grant in Aid with the delegation outside the Board meeting. CAO Kirk also encouraged further discussion with staff as feasible recommendations could then go forward to the Board in future, noting it is difficult for the Board to specify opportunities and commitments during the course of a delegation.

The Board also recommended that the Steering Committee consult with the Planning Coordinator about ideas and getting access to grant writing services as well. Although this is a great project and important work, the Board reiterated the under-resourcing at the CCRD.

The Board further noted interest discussed in a past meeting about food security where the previous Economic Development Officer was encouraged to do work around a transportation service to facilitate the food trade in the central coast. The Board noted that there are now fewer human resources to further food security on CCRD staff, though as the project is an ideal fit for a Community and Economic Development Officer, the project may be supported as a strategic priority in the future. The CCRD is also currently looking for a contract grant writer. Once that position is filled, the grant writing services may be able to assist the Steering Committee in identifying funding sources.

The Vice Chair thanked Ms. Howard and Ms. Beveridge for their presentation and concluded the delegation.

b. Todd Baker – Morrison & Hershfield

Vice Chair Kennedy welcomed Mr. Baker of Morrison and Hershfield to the meeting.

Mr. Baker initiated a Power Point slide deck through the share screen feature of the virtual board meeting and presented to the Board as follows:

Mr. Baker shared that he is a Senior Engineer with Morrison & Hershfield and has been doing waste related engineering and consulting in the BC and Yukon area for 25 years. Mr. Baker has worked with OM McIlwain for a few years around planning. Key items have been figuring out where the Bella Coola landfill may be out of compliance and helping figure out what to do next. This presentation is a summary of some of the most recent planning work completed.

In terms of an overview of work done recently, the work has been broken down into four steps. A landfill compliance review was undertaken which looked at comparing the new landfill criteria to what is going on at the site, and looked at areas of conformance and non-conformance. A lifespan analysis was also done wherein available capacity at the landfill was assessed. Findings were based on a number of factors which determined how long the landfill site could last. An options analysis was completed, as well as a landfill liability estimate separate. All of the findings combine to give an idea as to options with continuing to operate landfill and whether or not its cost effective.

Future steps depend on decisions around continuing to run landfill and trying to meet current landfill criteria. A checklist of conformance requirements comparing what is currently happening to the landfill and what the BC landfill criteria is was done. The landfill criteria is relatively new. Old criteria were in place since 1994 and recently updated. The requirements under the new criteria are more stringent.

Highlights of things to consider in operating the site are to prepare hydrogeology and hydrology characterization reports at groundwater and surface water levels. This will assist in getting a sense of how deep groundwater goes, which way it is flowing, are there any impacts right now down gradient of the site. Also to prepare a design operation and closure plan. This provides guidance on technical requirements to continue operating the landfill. Other considerations are in developing an environmental monitoring program. This entails laying out a plan for monitoring groundwater, surface water and if necessary, landfill gas. Another consideration would be implementing a final cover progressively. Typically landfills, once slopes are completed, are to be capped by an impermeable cover system. This needs to be done over the life of the landfill until the landfill is retired. The entire site is covered with some sort of final cover.

There are a number of things that would need to be addressed in reports and studies. This situation is not uncommon. When the landfill criteria came into effect not only the first one but the more recent version, lots of people have been scrambling in how to comply and figuring out what to do. Do we continue to run the landfill, or seek other options? You are not alone. This is a challenge to figure out for more remote areas and smaller landfills.

When looking at lifespan analysis, there are two options that were delved into. Option 1 would be to expand the landfill within the existing footprint. Option 2 would be to extend the landfill 15 m to the east, within existing cleared area but outside of footprint of waste fill. A final contour was prepared to see what is available in terms of volume for the landfill. Assumptions are made on population, waste disposal amounts, with a projection of volume metric fill rates to compare to available current volume. This analysis provides a number of years available for filling.

Option 1 is within existing the footprint. There are a number of requirements for what that needs to look like, with maximum side slopes and what the geometry needs to be. 32,000 cubic meters are currently available and the landfill has a lifespan of 12 years. This is one of many options. There are ways of playing with the geometry and footprint to get more years and volume out of the site. There may be more flexibility for this option. In the landfill criteria, one thing that needs to be considered is if the Ministry considers an option of a lateral expansion. Currently there are some grey areas with that definition, but any time a landfill will expand laterally, there may need to be a liner system put in place.

Right now this landfill is a natural continuation site. It's sitting on the ground and factors underneath the site, the ground and dilution, are serving to help treat or manage any leaching that may be generated at the site. The alternative to that is to put a liner system down and correct leaching that is generated at site. If that's required that can change things considerably.

Option 2 shows that the footprint is bigger. It stays within cleared area but goes outward to the east 15 meters. It ends up being over top of a demolition waste disposal area. You can see by doing that, you gain a bit of space. There's 75,000 cubic meters and a lifespan of 30 years. The ministry may be sticky with respect to what they consider lateral expansion.

The Board asked what "toe of the landfill" means in terms of filling vs other sides of the landfill. Mr. Baker responded that the toe is the bottom point of the fill area. That whole line around landfill is considered the toe. It could be called the footprint boundary as well.

The Board also noted that 15 m does not seem like a lot. Mr. Baker responded that it is a huge difference as far as capacity goes. When you extend the toe out, if you move the outer footprint by any distance, 15 m doesn't sound like a lot but you gain a lot when you go up. It's 3 dimensional, by pushing it out laterally you can then gain volume on side slopes and you can go higher. There are three requirements in landfill criteria: it has to be under a certain size, wherein this landfill is; further, it has to be remote and not within 100 km within another regional landfill; and finally, it also has to be less than 500 mm per year of precipitation, wherein this site meets that threshold.

The intent is, if you develop a large landfill it must be fully engineered. The Ministry does not want any further smaller sites that are just sitting on the ground. The issue is trying to find balance between requirements of Ministry and balancing that with costs. There is some flexibility with criteria and what they would consider a lateral expansion needs to be discussed. This option 2 still stays within the footprint. We don't know exactly where the old waste is in this landfill. That requires further discussion and analysis.

The Board asked for clarity around the calculation of options for lifespan, what assumptions have been made about education programs like recycling? Did they factor in the options? Mr. Baker responded that he is not able to give a solid answer. There likely was not any aggressive assumptions to further waste reduction. Mr. Baker assumed things would continue as per status quo in terms of disposal rates. If you can aggressively reduce the amount of waste, that changes things quite a bit. With these options, depending on what you do and how much waste is reduce or recycled, the CCRD can gain a certain number of years on both of these options.

These options need to be considered with respect to closure costs as well. An options analysis was done in that regard. Costs were estimated for continued operation, landfill upgrades, closing and capping the site, and ongoing operational costs. This was quantified in terms of overall cost per tonne and total cost over 30 years. Mr. Baker wanted to take that and compare to other options focussing on exporting waste. If you were to close landfill and do some transfer station upgrades and ship waste to another region, what would that cost be? This can give a sense of whether from a financial perspective, is it more cost effective to keep landfill and operate or close it and send waste somewhere else. The results of this depend on a number of factors. Things to consider are distance to other facilities which impacts the hauling costs. The hauling costs is primary factor of those options.

Option 1A is to export waste to District of Mount Waddington. There are other small communities that ship waste there. They charge an elevated tipping fee for out of region

waste. Option 1B would be to export waste to the Cariboo Regional District. Option 2 is to continue landfill operations. On a cost per tonne basis, it would cost \$1100/tonne to ship waste to Mount Waddington and \$516/tonne for the Cariboo Regional District, and \$335/tonne to continue operating the existing landfill.

The Board asked whether option 2 considers the installation of liner. Mr. Baker responded that no, right now it is assumed CCRD can operate under similar conditions. If a liner system were required, the liner on its own is not costly, but collection and management of leaching is a real challenge in a smaller site. If a liner system were required the numbers would shoot up a lot. It may not be close to being as cost effective. There's uncertainty around that.

In terms of a sensitivity analysis, for the waste export options there is an assumed \$50,000 host contribution per year and a possible inflated tipping fee. Those are built into the numbers that were presented. If we said there's no host fee for example, and tipping fee of \$80/tonne, that would make waste export to the Cariboo Regional District more viable with lower costs. The \$80/tonne is what Cariboo Regional District currently charges for waste, but that is not the full cost of landfilling in that region. The full cost is somewhere around \$100/tonne. The transportation part of sending waste to Mount Waddington is the key there in terms of making it quite expensive. Everything hinges on what you would be charged at the other end. There's no certainty around that.

With exporting waste, there are a few things to consider. There is still responsibility for landfill liability as the landfill doesn't go away. There is an obligation to report liability numbers and an obligation to close and cap the landfill. Costs depend on other regions. If you do that you give up some control. May be able to enter into long term agreement but at the end of the agreement you are at the whim of another region. Costs could be higher than the status quo. Right now waste export is the higher cost option. The differences between costs are not significant enough now to say waste export could be much less. Continued landfill operation is more cost effective. CCRD is in control of disposal and the costs. What we often assume is that a landfill is a valuable resource. In all options, costs are likely to increase overall.

Landfill liability calculations relate to closure and post closure costs. Closure costs relate to the capping system, which are materials that are placed on top of the landfill so that precipitation doesn't get into the landfill. Example are soil caps or a plastic membrane. If the landfill is expanded, it doesn't increase costs that much for closure and is still in the \$2 million range. If we can convince the Ministry that a lower standard can be justified it may save \$400,000 on capping costs. Overall, if you will run a landfill over 40 years, \$400,000 is not significant. If the landfill continues to operate it is best to run for as long as possible to spread out closure costs over a longer timeframe. Money can be saved to do those closures.

Landfill liability needs to be calculated and reported every year. Accounting standard exists for this. PS 3280 is coming into effect April 2022. Option 1 liability is \$2 million. Option 2 is \$1.4 million. Under PS 3270, the sooner you have to fully close landfill, the higher the numbers are going to be. It reflects period over which costs are spread. An additional thing

to think about is the uncertainty with requirements with landfill expansion. We don't know what the Ministry would say is lateral expansion. This requires further discussion. If you're down gradient of the site in the direction of groundwater flow, and there are impacts, that could change things. May require more and better landfill closure. If there are significant impacts, the Ministry could require the landfill be lined and the leaching collected. It assumes no huge impact to environment.

There are some risks with waste export including uncertainty with transportation costs. If it comes to an agreement, hopefully lock into an agreement for maybe five years. Once agreements are up I've seen transportation costs go up significantly. There is uncertainty around fluctuating disposal costs, due to being at the whim of another region. It is hard to say what long term costs would look like. They can change their fees as they like depending on what they're dealing with in their sites and their costs.

The Board asked what he has seen in other regions when faced with same issue.

Mr. Baker responded that the size of regions and landfills will be different. The Comox Valley Regional District (CVRD), for example, faced the same pressures. CVRD had two regional landfills, both of which were out of compliance. Mr. Baker did a similar analysis for them. They decided to have one regional landfill and put all of their money in that site. What they found was it's not just the operation of these facilities, its trying to account for all of waste diversion, and reduction costs money as well. There was pressure to reduce waste, which ultimately takes away from revenue. Faced with less revenue, the CVRD raised landfill tipping fees, implemented new tax across whole region, and reduced operational costs. The landfill with tipping fees is a revenue generator and helps pay for landfill. The Capital Regional District did the same thing. Be aware of tipping fees around you to stay in same range, otherwise waste will go to those lower cost areas. They use tipping fees to pay for everything.

The Board asked about incinerators. Mr. Baker replied that they do waste energy work for some regions on Vancouver Island and a small-scale waste energy study was completed recently. On a general level, the technology for small-scale energy recovery is not really far along in terms of whether they are proven or not. In Nova Scotia a pilot is happening. Waste energy is more viable when there is a lot of waste. Technologies that exist can combust waste and lower the volume, then disposal of ash is required. They're more of an elaborate or complex way to burn garbage safely and to reduce volume.

The Board raised concerns about transportation. Even if a way to transport economically occurred, there is still the issue of carbon footprint and environmental damage. Based on projections on how many tonnes of garbage to be moved, what do tonnes work out to per truck? Director Northeast lived in Cache Creek in the days of their landfill. That was a constant conversation at the local restaurant. They would count how many trucks were going in and out of the landfill. Do we have a sense of how many trucks it would take on a yearly basis?

Mr. Baker responded that the answer is in the analysis. Assumptions were made as to how large the containers would need to be. Probably assume 40 cubic yard containers. Mr.

Baker does not remember the haul frequency that is in the report. The analysis on greenhouse gas emissions with hauling found that transportation in the comparison of options, green house gas emissions were not significant in that regard. If you look at it from the whole system, landfills generate green house gas emissions which are released to the atmosphere if untreated or unmanaged. Does landfill at receiving end manage gas? If they do then transportation considerations become insignificant.

Vice Chair thanked Mr. Baker for his presentation and concluded the delegation.

A recess was called at 10:30 a.m.

The Board reconvened at 10:42 a.m.

PART III – LOCAL GOVERNANCE

(A) OPERATIONS UPDATES & POLICY MATTERS ARISING

OPERATIONS

a) Solid Waste Service Update

21-02-02 **M/S Directors Bertrand/Hall** THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the Solid Waste Service Update. **CARRIED**

GOVERNANCE

b) AVICC Conventions Registration and Call for Resolutions

21-02-03 **M/S Directors Hall/Bertrand** THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the AVICC Conventions Registration and Call for Resolutions. **CARRIED**

c) RFD – AVICC/UBCM Resolution: Funding for Landfill Compliance and Closure

21-02-04 **M/S Directors Northeast/Bertrand** THAT the Board of Directors of the Coast Regional District receives the Request for Decision – AVICC/UBCM Resolution: Funding for Landfill Compliance and Closure. **CARRIED**

21-02-05 **M/S Directors Kennedy/Bertrand** THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District direct Administration to revise the resolution to acknowledge First Nations interests and inclusion before submitting the “Funding for Landfill Compliance and Closure” resolution to the Association of Vancouver Island and Coastal Communities May 28th, 2021 virtual convention. **CARRIED**

COMMUNITY & DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

d) Request for Decision: BC Organic Extension

- 21-02-06** M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the request for decision: BC Organic Extension. **CARRIED**
- 21-02-07** M/S Directors Northeast/Bertrand THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District invite a delegation on BC Organic Extension to the March 11, 2021 regular board meeting. **CARRIED**

LAND USE AND PLANNING SERVICE

e) RFD – Board Remuneration Local Housing Needs Assessment

- 21-02-08** M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the request for decision on Board Remuneration for Local Housing Needs Assessment. **CARRIED**
- 21-02-09** M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District approve remuneration for Directors' voluntary attendance at Housing Engagement Sessions at a local work assignment rate of \$36 per hour for a maximum of 2 hours' time. **CARRIED**

f) Crown Land Application for Transportation – Kristoffer Everatt

- 21-02-10** M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the referral on Crown Land Application for Transportation - Everatt. **CARRIED**

g) Preliminary Subdivision Referral (Mecham)

- 21-02-11** M/S Directors Northeast/Bertrand THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the referral on Preliminary Subdivision Referral (Mecham). **CARRIED**

h) Water Approval for Changes in and about a Stream (Kynoch)

- 21-02-12** M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District receives the referral on Water Approval for Changes in and about a Stream (Kynoch). **CARRIED**

FINANCIAL SERVICES

i) 5-Year Financial Plan 2021-2025 Development – Presentation

21-02-13 M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the Board of Directors of the Central Coast Regional District tables the 5 Year Financial Plan 2021-2025 Development Presentation for the March 11, 2021 regular board meeting. **CARRIED**

(B) EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Area D Report: Director Northeast

Vice Chair Kennedy invited Director Northeast to provide his Area D report tabled from the February 10-11, 2021 meeting.

Director Northeast provided his verbal report as follows:

I want to thank my colleagues on the Board of Directors for your grace two weeks ago. I was not able to attend and neither was my Alternate. My colleagues carried the bulk of the work this month and left important items for me to be part of today like solid waste management. Good people are already working on this. I would like to be more involved in waste diversion. To the constituents, I'm thinking of Shannon Michaelchuk and Joan Sawicki who have kept my feet to the fire. I reaffirm interest in the discussion.

I also want to give a nod to the two delegations today. The people from Bella Coola food security, I believe doing a food security assessment or a food resiliency assessment is a good step toward creating a food charter. This could also be a useful item to inform our thinking around emergency management. Given current state of capacity and resources, I know that is a big ask. We need to find creative solutions on how we can support the society. I am not a technical person. I appreciate Mr. Baker's presentation around the landfill. I understand things better than I did a few hours ago.

In Area D, we've avoided snow. There was a snow warning last night for the Valley. It didn't seem to pan out. We got 5 cm of snow. It reminds me when I come home in afternoon and water is in the basement, I'm not alone. People are stretched to the max with the pandemic. Someone said we're all in the same boat. We're all in the same storm, some have a luxury liner, some have a door. It's with that reality that we need to be there for one another and be extra compassionate and do what we can to get through the storm. I thank the staff. I know you are working hard in trying times and trying conditions. Thank you for everything you do. I hope to see Director Schooner soon.

Vice Chair Kennedy thanked Director Northeast for his report.

(D) ADJOURNMENT

21-02-14 M/S Directors Bertrand/Northeast THAT the meeting be adjourned. **CARRIED**

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


Chair


Chief/Administrative Officer