



## **REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH OKANAGAN**

NOTES of a meeting of the Shuswap River Watershed Sustainability Plan INTERAGENCY RELATIONS, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WORKING GROUP held in the Board Room at the Regional District Office on June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012, 6:30 pm – 9:30 pm.

**Members:** Henry Bremer  
Herman Halvorson  
Kelly Wozniak  
Laura Jameson  
Pricilla Judd  
~~Ray Nadeau~~ Dale Kerr as substitute  
Sandy Thon  
Shirley Fowler  
~~Melanie Staker~~  
Rick Fairbairn

**Observers:** Mike Macnabb

**Staff:** Anna Page Sustainability Coordinator  
Laura Frank Sustainability Coordinator and Planning

---

### **PART 1 – CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**1.1 Welcome by RDNO staff, Anna Page and Laura Frank**

### **PART 2 – APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved as presented.

### **PART 3 – INTRODUCTIONS**

**3.1 Brief introduction by all participants.**

Anna Page and Laura Frank welcomed all attendees, a round table introduction followed.

### **PART 4 – ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012 meeting were adopted as presented and will be posted on the RDNO SRWSP website.

### **PART 5 – BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

### **PART 6 – NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

The meeting started out with a discussion on funding of the SRWSP. The Electoral Area Advisory Committee recently made a recommendation to the board that an additional \$50,000 of Community Works Funds be allocated to the SRWSP process.

A question was raised as to whether or not the Community Works Funding could be used to hire a conservation officer. Initial feeling is that it probably does not fit within the CWF criteria but **RDNO staff will look into this.**

It was noted that the Ministry of Community, Sport & Development may be a potential funding source for watershed planning activities / actions.

Action item: If we find we are unable to achieve or implement some of the recommendations that come out of this process because they do not fit in with funding criteria we can make the request to our politicians to lobby UBCM to request changes to the funding parameters.

### **6.1 Review Agency Roles and Responsibilities**

A document was distributed that outlined the roles and responsibilities of various agencies with respect to watersheds.

### **6.2 Issues raised by other two Working Groups**

The document mentioned above included a list of issues raised within the other two working groups for the IRRR working group to tackle.

Included in this list was the question how can the community be more involved in decisions relating to Provincial Ministry approvals (e.g. Forestry: cut blocks, logging type (selective vs. clear cuts), large scale spraying of pesticides).

From this list came discussion of the need for a group that would have an on-going presence that could be used as a means for the community to be consulted on various activities in the Watershed, especially on Crown Land. Group could also act as a vehicle for community members to take their concerns to.

Key topic areas/flag words/criteria should be developed that would prompt consultation.

Geographic interest areas could also be mapped as triggers.

Look at other examples to provide a model.

The group should have a mechanism to identify and act on repetitive issues as they arise – adaptive role.

This type of approach would be effective in providing more information and knowledge to the community about activities underway or proposed within the watershed.

The question was raised as to whether or not there is legislation out there to allow the community to take further control of the watershed? **RDNO staff to look into this.**

Potential strategy “Lobby UBCM for additional opportunities to manage the protection of our waterways”.

- Pursue FCM federal lobby opportunities.

It was noted that currently the community watershed regulations are in disarray and are in the process of being rewritten.

In the end the ability to have greater control over the watershed and transparency within industries that carry out activities within the watershed comes down to the Acts. If the Acts are not tightened up staff and the community do not have the legislation to back up their requests / demands.

Discussion ensued around having the Compliance & Enforcement officer for our region come to talk to all working groups about what is currently being done within the watershed and what tools they currently have. The group felt that maybe it would be more appropriate to get speakers in once more of the SRWSP has been drafted.

It would be more beneficial to have a speaker come in who could address / identify opportunities as to how “we” the community can be more involved in the consultation of large scale activities within the watershed.

Objective: To facilitate partnerships and collaboration in Watershed Management. (Federal, Provincial and Local realms; how do we make these links?) There needs to be a concrete mechanism on how to improve collaboration.

There needs to be open communication and the elimination of memorandums of understanding.

**RDNO to forward to TAC:** How can we improve upon communication between agencies (Federal, Provincial and local Gov.)?

- Can they identify efficiencies
- Or a potential model that would have a chance of success for consultation and increased awareness of activities within the watershed.

The group was asked to discuss the issues around the legal dock that was constructed in the Lower Shuswap River (Mara area).

Comments that arose were as follows:

- It does not appear that anyone is looking at the cumulative impacts of these structures.
- There is a problem with site by site approvals
  - Noted that we should pursue zoning the surface of water to have more control over what is permitted.
- **Potential Strategy:** review existing rules for dock design / approvals and create a river specific approach/ approval process.

A comment was made by the Board Directors on the committee that when RDNO receives referrals from provincial ministries regarding activities on Crown Lands / Water that the timeframe provided for response was often not adequate for the referrals to be sent to the Area Planning Commissions (meet monthly) and the Electoral Area Advisory Committee for comment.

- Need for appropriate referral time frame.
- RDNO may have to fast track some high concern referrals to ensure feedback is provided by their deadlines.

Discussion shifted to whether or not there is a mechanism in place to target issue / problem areas within the waterways for the RCMP boat to respond to? **RDNO staff to follow up with Roy Morgan safe communities' coordinator re: River Watch program.**

### **6.3 Development of IRRR Goal, Objectives and Strategies**

The group was handed out the IRRR "Worksheet" where they:

- Reviewed the draft goal statement
- Identified additional objectives
- Discussed strategies / actions
  - Discussion of the "One Point of Contact" approach

Based on time the group did not get far in working through the "worksheet". The edits and suggestions that were made have been included in the revised "IRRR worksheet" which is attached to these minutes.

### **6.4 Discuss and review "Education and Awareness" Goal and possible wording for the "Quality of Life" & "Climate Change" Goals**

The groups did not have time to address these topic areas; they will be discussed at the July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **PART 7 – WORKING GROUP MATTERS**

### **7.1 Membership/Appointments**

### **7.2 Mileage Reimbursement**

Working group members will be reimbursed for mileage to meetings at \$0.52 per km. A mileage record sheet was circulated; members will be paid at the end of the meeting period.

### **7.3 Future Meeting Dates and Locations**

Next meeting will be July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012, 6:30 – 9:30 pm at the RDNO offices.

### **7.4 Upcoming Community Events**

No Wake Flotilla (Lower Shuswap) – July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Heritage Tea & Duck Race (Mara) 12:00 – 4:00 pm July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2012

## **PART 8 - ADJOURNMENT**