

Special Council meeting
May 12, 2008
Continued discussion of the OCP
Starting at page. 58

Gord; Let's not spend too much time on it now, need to get it ready for the public meeting on the 20th

Laurie: When did council decide that the public meeting was going to be on the 20th?

Gord: At the last meeting.

Laurie: No, we decided that the schedule would be left flexible

Gord: We had to set a date so we could give the public time to make plans to attend.

Utilities- section 23

Steve: Sect 23.4.4 Since we don't have a watershed plan we should use the term "develop a watershed plan" not "update".

Larry: 23.2.1. "establish" an infrastructure plan.

Laurie/ Larry: 23.2.4 confusion here. Lets just say "Annually update DCCs to reflect true costs."

Steve: We've allocated \$40k to update our DCCs does this mean we'll have to do this every year?

Ron: No, can update inhouse usually by updating the costs of construction and other costs; adding in additional infrastructure projects for example.

Jackie: Different types of devel will have different costs. Hard to leave it out without some sort of explanation.

Mike: yes, DCCS are different depending on the type of structure that is being built (single family v multifamily)

Laurie: Just need to determine the total infrastructure requirements and adjust costs annually. This point is addressing two separate concepts and needs to be two points:

- 1) Annually adjust DCCs to reflect actual costs.
- 2) Research other development typologies (so we know the difference between the costs for a dockside green project v a traditional project)

#2 was deleted from document.

Laurie: Wanted 23.2.3 to say "monitor infrastructure capacity and update projections in light of new development and restrict capacity to insure capacity is not exceeded" but got no support.

Lloyd: 23.3.6 add in encourage grey water for use in recycling. (maybe was added as a separate .7)

Laurie 23.2.6 "prepare" not just "consider" sustainable growth practices. Suggests we use the UN commission on the environment definition from 1983 "meets the needs of present without compromising future needs

23.4.5 Replace "consider" with "establish" best management practices for develop within watershed...

Laurie: 23.4.4 (.a) Initiate accurate measurements for seasonal flow and temperature in all licensed watershed creeks" no reliable data temperature keeps track of climate change.

Larry: Wouldn't a credible water management plan include that?

Laurie: Not necessarily. Better to include specific policy. It wasn't in the water reports

that we have had in the past. Need to plan for next year's flow measurements. Based on what has happened in the past, need to plan.

Steve/Jill: All streams? What would that cost? What does that entail?

Gord: this is something that should be referred to staff to investigate and include in a water management plan.

Mike: I'll check it out.

Laurie: needs to be year round

Mike: you are talking about monitoring for 10-20 years to get data on climate change.

Laurie: yes, but you have to start somewhere.

Gord: needs staff report before we can include it in the OCP but could possibly go in water management plan.

Jill: Since we have already decided to create a watershed management plan, isn't this just one element of it? We shouldn't just pull out separate pieces of the overall plan.

Gord: first it was "update" and now its "develop". We need to water down some of the hysteria- we are managing the watershed.

Jackie: But measurement keeps coming up in so many areas: water, infrastructure needs, the sewer interceptor line etc. it is important to people. Add "including watershed boundaries and initiatives to accurately measure flows throughout the year" (passed).

Laurie: 23.3.1 should prohibit release of water into sewage system.

Laurie: 23.5.3 replace "in balance" with "within capacity"

Mike: A lot depends on how you time the flow. In balance refers to timing.

Lloyd: we have never exceeded the capacity of the plant. Its the capacity of our pipes, the delivery system that is the problem.

Jill: Add " in balance and within capacity"

Laurie: need to add power, phone, tv to utilities section. Suggests: Require underground services in all new devel and encourage it in old areas.

Gord: that would be expanding the scope of the section. This just deals with city owned.

Laurie: section deals with all utilities, not all owned by city.

Steve: I'd like to encourage alternative sources of power sources too: solar, geothermal, biomass, wind. Etc.

Lloyd: 23.6.2 Support the establishment of compost site and program. Wanted to change community to regional. Saying what people really wanted was a place to take garden clippings. Got voted down

Jackie: loud and clear in community- this is important. Could be at the old mining school. Behind a gate. (so people don't dump other stuff)

Steve: bears? He has heard from people interested in this too.

Mike: wet waste is big issue. RDKB hasn't been able to solve yet.

Gord: its supported in SSP

Governance: section 24

24.2.4 make groups plural

Laurie: 24.2.3 drop "unnecessary and onerous steps" and add "while maintaining ample opportunity for public input."

Larry: what about " without minimizing public consultation"

Stacey: there could be opptys for streamlining that don't impact the public.

Gord: farther down it talks about public consultation. I don't know how many times you have to say a thing.

Larry: sometimes you just can't say it enough!

Steve: 24.2.7 delete "consider" and use "establish communications network" (Passed)

Community economic devel section 25

Gord 25.2 will check back with Erin about what she meant. Lets look at the 3 objectives the steering committee suggests adding.

Larry: add support and recognize cominco in background. Its not an objective.

Gord: add support for work force, add support for entrepreneurs. What about policy work with devel to create year round employment.

Laurie: Why just developers? Add in year round to 25.1.3 (was .7 in old numbering scheme)

Laurie: Change to "develop community economic dev strategy and participate in regional economic deve strategy" agreed on intent, staff to work on language a bit more.

Resource management section 26

Gord 26.2.1 staff suggests a change: "development should only be considered within the areas designated as Resource Management Area on schedule B land use designations when impacts affecting the community's water supply, viewsheds and agricultural opportunities are carefully considered. " passed.

Jill: wanted to add something about wildlife corridors and species mapping and inventories but was told it is better suited for natural environment this section just deals with the grey area of the maps. She is looking to establish baseline data. Refer back to section 14. 2.10 where it is covered.

Jill: so the grey areas don't include the watershed?

Stacey: yes. Watersheds are included.

Jill: in response to the community I think we need to set some strong language about the watershed.

Gord: 23. 1.5 talks about the catchment areas..

Jill: yes, but that still refers to how activities are conducted in the watershed., not protecting the whole thing.

Gord: This is a 5 year document. Last meeting Steve said, watershed, watershed watershed, and pretty soon it looks like a one issue document. I caution council against responding to "initiatives" and being reactionary.

Jill: Ok then move watershed to natural environment. Doesn't think they are being reactionary.

Gord: no then you'd have to rewrite all sorts of objectives and policies that flow from it.

Laurie: given the interest and importance of the watershed to the community I don't think it can be emphasized enough. Agrees with jill- needs an objective here in resource management. "to protect rossland's watershed to insure the quality and quantity "

Larry: its mentioned in the back ground so it should have some objectives and policies in this section. Shows we are listening to citizens concerns.

Gord: yeah, and I'm sure things will settle down because of it.

Laurie's motion:" To protect Rossland's watersheds in order to insure a safe, adequate and reliable supply of water" (it may have said something about the future needs too)

Lloyd: 5 places were it is mentioned; think it is covered already.
All voted for it.

Jill : forest resources; should say something about discouraging clear cutting or prohibiting clear cutting in the residential areas. (thinking of Black diamond)
Stacey: could add it in 14.2.6

Lloyd: 26.1.4 wants to preserve the periphery green belt but not limit boundary expansion.

Mike: this doesn't limit boundary expansion, this just not allow leap frogging development.

26.2.10 watershed- gord prefers "update and consolidate" but elsewhere was already stated as "develop" so develop wins here too.

26.2.11 Steve: replace encourage with require devel of tourism and resource related activities within the watershed to be undertaken in an environmentally sensitive manner.

Laurie: wanted to add" restrict activities in the watershed to those that have low risk of contamination or degradation of the watershed." But Jackie said it sounds too negative and subjective; whose definition of low impact?

laurie: this whole doc is subjective in many ways.

Larry" too open to interpetation. If we cant identify it we can't enforce it.

(No support)

Laurie: add in viewsheds .14 "work with RDKB and other landowners to protect viewscapes". Mike and Stacey to work out language.

Laurie: In energy conservation, add in generation. .16 add solar, geothermal and biomass.

Tried to get "no impact" or "no negative impact on watershed" but go no support.

Jackie pointed out that some impacts can be enhancements.

Council did not finish Resource management p 64

Decided to take it to the public as is, no more working meetings. Will have to do it all again once the public has its say.

Tomorrows meeting is to hear report from Erin about the public's input on the SSP.

Jackie is overwhelmed with another 100 page document she has to read. Cant they finish the OCP then move back to the SSP? When saw the note about possibly switching priorities to include water just felt it was all too much.

Gord: no. Has foot on gas pedal doesn't want to delay into the summer. Only real issue tomorrow is whether or not council is going to add water and if so, take on 4 areas to start or drop one? If take on a new one, then select a few action items.

Need to give time for staff to incorporate all the changes.

Laurie: staff will be out of town

Stacey: we have all the changes already incorporated up until tonight.

Laurie but we still have the schedules and maps to do too before we review it with the public.

Jill: why don't we just say it isn't complete but here it is and we'll carry on after we have heard from the public.

Laurie: I think we need the next meeting on May 20th

Gord: that is the public meeting. Cant change it.
No next meeting set.