

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF MOUNT WADDINGTON

QUATSINO SOLID WASTE & ROAD ACCESS

PUBLIC MEETING RECORD

MEETING RECORD for the public meeting held on Friday, October 3rd, 2014 at the Quatsino School Building, 150 West Quatsino Road, Quatsino.

CHAIR: Andrew Hory, Electoral Area C Director.

STAFF: Greg Fletcher, Administrator; Patrick Donaghy, Operations Manager; Jonas Velaniskis, Planning Manager

PUBLIC: 14

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson at 11:00 am.

INTRODUCTION: The Chair introduced the panel and stated the purpose of the public meeting to discuss:

- a. proposed amendment to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan to enable Bylaw No. 859; and
- b. existing policies of the Quatsino Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 656, 2002, related to access to Quatsino.

He then noted that at the close of each presentation, each member of the public will have an opportunity to speak following a reading of the written submissions. He noted that the meeting would be held in a public hearing format to ensure that everyone had a fair opportunity to be heard.

PROPOSED WMP AMENDMENT:

The Manager of Operations stated that the purpose of proposed amendment to the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan is to introduce a waste management service for the control, collection and disposal of garbage and recyclables generated in the community of Quatsino. He then reviewed a summary of the amendment. In response to questions, he noted that the Regional District has no service relationship to the old dump in Quatsino and costs of cleaning up the old dump were not the Regional District's responsibility but that it would coordinate such a clean-up with the start of operations of a new transfer station.

WMP WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

The Administrator read out the following written submissions on the proposed WMP amendment that were submitted by e-mail prior to October 3rd, 2014:

- 1) John Retallack, September 26, 2014 6:53 PM
"Regarding the Regional District meeting, as you are aware from last year I am in favour of the centralized waste management process for Quatsino. I am not able to attend the meeting but could certainly provide further comments if needed."
- 2) Stew and Shelley Erickson, September 29/09/2014 8:30 PM
"We understand many communities across Canada have been undertaking waste management issues and agree we need to protect our environment. We also understand there will be a cost to this service and we will gladly accept whatever the community and regional district decide on."
- 3) John Tyler October 2,2014 6:31 PM
"I support the amendment to the community's solid waste plan and would be willing to support the new services."

The following written submissions were received prior to the deadline but were inadvertently missed and thus not read at the meeting:

- 4) Glen Anderson. September-29-14 8:55 PM. "As for the Dump. I dislike the condition of this dump and agree that it needs attention and management. Again, I am FOR a dump improvement program and would be happy to help in this process."
- 5) Nancy Botham September-26-14 7:43 PM " Although I feel recycling is important, for it to work in Quatsino, I think convenience & cost are significant factors to consider. So I question the following: • Running the facility using only volunteers--I feel there should be one paid head operator or have a few trained people that could share the job & are paid by the hour; • Hours of operation in a week--I think the ideal setup would be to have the bins open to residents during the day / locked at night, so people could use them at their convenience. (They wouldn't have to be open everyday.); • What is the extra cost to residents through Property Taxes? (\$.60 on each \$1000.00 assessed value seems high to me.) Could there possibly be a Senior's Rate or a Commercial Rate (Lodges)?; • User Fee: Will this also happen? The person manning the Depot will have to deal with money. Will residents accept a user fee?; • It would be good to know how these facilities are operated in other communities eg Sointula."

**WMP VERBAL
SUBMISSIONS:**

The Chair opened the floor to verbal submissions concerning the proposed waste management plan amendment:

- 1) Ernie Stewart. Agrees with the need to implement the service as soon as possible. Would prefer user fees to taxation with perhaps the exception of one time start-up costs. Concerned with the potential for ever increasing taxation so would like to make sure that a year of study is done so that assumptions can be tested before full implementation.
- 2) Ivan Janecek. Concerned about the cost impact on old people on fixed incomes and a lack of employment in the community. It will be a big change and the impacts need to be minimized.
- 3) Elva Janecek. Concerned about the proposed location of the waste management site at the current fire hall location being too close to the centre of town. Smell was identified as a potential concern.
- 4) Peter Solga. Commented that this is an opportunity for the community to participate in planning for solid waste management rather than be forced to deal with the issue in the future if nothing is done now.
- 5) David Addison. Agrees that the change is inevitable but will the RD consult prior to full implementation? A- Yes, will consult at each stage of implementation. Also concerned that people will continue to use the existing illegal dump or alternative location for disposal of materials that are not part of the proposed waste transfer process.
- 6) Gwen Hansen. Supports the new system noting that commercial lodges etc., will also have the opportunity to utilize the local facility instead of incurring costs to otherwise remove solid waste.
- 7) Jean Schenfelder. Expressed concern that the taxation would be 'cast in stone'.
 - It was elaborated that the proposed limit of \$10,000 or 60c/\$1000 could only be changed by going through a bylaw amendment process but the 60c could potentially yield more than \$10,000 if assessments rose with inflation.It was also suggested that if the solid waste services is implemented all properties should be paying into the service, not just the ones with improvements.

- 8) Andrew Hanson – What is the community assessment and how much would the cost be, based on that assessment?
- *The RD will provide more information [2013: 128 parcels (excluding 13 parcels owned by government agencies) yielded \$17.2m net assessed value for which a \$10,000 requisition (the proposed bylaw cap) would result in a tax of 58 cents/\$1000 assessment residential. Or, 60c/\$1000 would yield \$10,300]*
- 9) Elva Janacek – Will RD staff come back to help once the service is established?
- Yes
- 10) Vicky Reeves – Will any money from recycling sales be returned to the service?
- *Yes, all revenues would be retained by the service*
- 11) David Addison – A barge will be coming next week to remove 150 tonnes of metal. That would be a good opportunity for the community to get out any accumulated metals. Is there a plan to buy a property or to site the transfer station on crown land?
- *The plan is to use one of the sites that the RD currently owns or leases on behalf of Quatsino (the firehall site and the museum site). The RD Gas tax fund would not cover the cost of property purchase and crown land is currently unavailable in a timely manner. The RD will have to convert the firehall lease to include transfer station as an allowed use. If there was a strong consensus that the community wished to pursue purchasing land at taxpayer expense, the RD would not object.*

The Chair commented that he sensed that there was a general consensus to proceed with the necessary amendment to the Waste Management Plan. After hearing no further input, he stated that the minutes of the meeting and a revised version of the plan that reflected comments/corrections would be posted on the RDMW website.

**ROAD ACCESS POLICIES
OF OCP BYLAW NO. 656**

INTRODUCTION:

The Manager of Planning noted that the Quatsino Official Community Plan (OCP Bylaw 656) states that establishing a permanent road access to the community will be addressed when a majority of property owners indicate that open access will not significantly jeopardize the unique character and the rural lifestyle of its residents. He presented a report that concluded that Provincial, First Nations and forestry interests will also need to be addressed if a policy change is desired and Federal funding implications can be expected if the current public wharf becomes an alternative to road access. A question was answered regarding the need to make informed assumptions when talking about future implications for the federal wharf if road access is achieved.

**ACCESS WRITTEN
SUBMISSIONS:**

The Administrator read out the following written submissions on about considering a community plan amendment to advocate permanent road access, that were submitted by e-mail prior to October 3rd, 2014:

- 1) John Retallack Friday, September 26, 2014 6:53 PM
"I am also in favour of retaining the limited access nature of Quatsino. I firmly believe any type of access road is a net negative for the community. Is there any indication of a potential threat to either plan, especially retention of the limited access nature of Quatsino?"
- 2) Jean & Walter Schoenfeler Mon 29/09/2014 120 PM
"I Definitely do NOT want to have ANY road access to Quatsino. It would bring in too much traffic, vandalism and would change the whole feeling of the community."
- 3) Stew and Shelley Erickson Mon 29/09/2014 8:30 PM
"As far as road access is concerned, we are new to the community and maybe not be aware of all the pros/cons, however, we built our home without the road access and are confident we wouldn't use it in the future. One of the reasons we purchased in this unique community of Quatsino was because of the remoteness. Our home is a seasonal home, and we appreciate the privacy and protection this small community offers."

The following written submission was received prior to the deadline but were inadvertently missed and thus not read at the meeting:

- 4) Glen Anderson. September-29-14 8:55 PM. *"I have been a part time resident and land owner in Quatsino for the past 14 years. My dream is to build a home and retire here. I am a hobbyist and an artist and enjoy the peacefulness of Quatsino and this is what drew me to this part of the world. However, without access to this beautiful town by road...I find myself not coming here as often as I should, nor am I able to bring the supplies needed to build my home and work on my land with only the boat in access. I understand that many residents, including myself, would wish that Quatsino stay remote in a sense...and for the town to maintain its safeness and tranquility. However I think it is important that there is proper access to our town as well. It could bring more friends and family and possibly more revenue and therefore more amenities to accommodate residents and visitors alike...as well, the residents would be more able to transport supplies and equipment. So without saying more...I am FOR having a road to access Quatsino and would be happy to help in this process."*

**ACCESS VERBAL
SUBMISSIONS:**

The Chair opened the floor to verbal submissions concerning the community support for a community plan amendment that would support permanent road access:

- 1) David Addison. Until Western Forest Products (WFP) closed the road this summer, the connecting access to Holberg had been in place for 4 years. Managed to get the names of 30 people who want a road. The OCP did not represent the views of the entire community in 2002. Suggested that the definition of Quatsino's rural character be updated. Prefers that the RD does not send out a letter asking for input because it may influence the results due to misleading information about the impact on wharf divestiture or taxation. The community is currently strapped without

access and the future of the community depends on the development that a road could bring. Have talked to Norm Parks, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Transportation who provided the process outline for getting a new road.

- 2) Ivan Janecek. It should be considered whether the road is usable or not. In the rest of the village we only have a partial road because there are no right of ways over much of the actual road length and no proper turnarounds. We don't need a road.
- 3) Gwen Hansen. The 2002 OCP took five years to complete and was done through a series of public and open meetings representing the views of far more than 8 people. It was a community process.
- 4) Ernie Stewart. The community has changed in the last 10-12 years and there could not be any more productive way to bring in families than to open up a road connection. Unfortunately, that would likely lead to wharf divestiture as well as a large increase in taxation but I'd still be willing to pay.
- 5) Peter Solga. Noted that most of the people supporting the road seem to have their properties for sale. Based on 13 years in the aquaculture business, to attract and retain families, the community needs to be attractive to women, too. Suggested voting on the road access issue.
- 6) Gwen Hanson. A road may bring in people, but not necessarily jobs. Winter Harbour's experience was that the community based jobs left with their road connection.
- 7) Ivan Janecek. Understood that the right of way stops at Sherbrooke L. – Yes
- 8) Elva Jancek. Insurance is much lower without road access. The existing road is not maintained properly; how would we expect that a new road would be any different? People would dump garbage in the community.
- 9) Ernie Stewart. Would a vote help resolve the issue? – *perhaps*
- 10) Tom Botel. Perhaps a positive vote by the community would impact Quatsino First Nation's position on the road access.
- 11) Josh Solga. Is there a possibility of making Quatsino a gated community? – *no*
- 12) David Addison. Why not ask the question?

The Chair noted that there does not seem to be a clear consensus to support moving forward with an OCP amendment at this time. He also noted that it is important for the Regional District to respect the position of the Quatsino First Nation which is currently on record as opposing the road access. Until this changes and other issues are resolved there are other issues facing the seven Electoral Area C communities that have a higher priority, including the Quatsino amendment to the solid waste plan. Invited further submissions regarding the issue and encouraged anyone who hasn't stated their position to make their opinion known. The Quatsino Advisory Planning Commission may wish to review the OCP and revisit this issue and others that may have arisen since 2002.

NEW BUSINESS:

The Planning Manager provided an update to a study regarding slide hazard in west Quatsino. He reviewed the file, noting that a slide on Nov. 9, 1989 had destroyed a house. The current study is expected to be completed within a month and all property owners that may be impacted have been contacted. Letters with preliminary study results were made available to all attending the meeting.

The Chair invited anyone with an interest in the West Quatsino slide assessment to stay and review the maps provided by the Planning Manager.

ADJOURN:

The Chair thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and sharing their opinions and declared the meeting adjourned at 1:35pm.