



**SCOTT RESOURCE SERVICES INC.**  
**Environmental Consultants**  
31856 Silverdale Avenue, Mission, B.C. V2V 2K9  
Tel: (604) 820-1415 Fax: (604) 820-1621  
[E-mail: mission@scottres.ca](mailto:mission@scottres.ca)

October 14, 2011

Our file: 394-08  
DFO File: 09-HPAC-PA2-00271

Mayor and Council  
District of Mission Municipal Hall  
8645 Stave Lake St  
Box 20  
Mission, BC V2V 4L9

**Re; Proposed Commercial and Residential Development at Wren Street and Lougheed Highway, Mission, B.C.**

Dear Mayor and Council,

Scott Resource Services Inc. (SRS) is the Qualified Environmental Professional for the above noted project proposed within the District of Mission (DoM). At the request of our client Carhoun and Sons Enterprises Ltd. (CSE), we are providing you with a brief summary of this project as it relates to timelines, Authorization of a Harmful Alteration, Disruption or Destruction of fish habitat (HADD) and completion of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) Screening and Screening report.

Please note the following timeline of events to date:

- September 9, 2009 — Submission of our Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed project to Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).
- October 26, 2009 - Initial response from DFO indicating the project would not move forward due to the extensive destruction of fish habitat.
- August 18, 2010 — Senior DFO staff overturn initial CEAA rejection and proceed to initiate the CEAA trigger and process and indicate that it will be completed in a timely manner.
- November 5, 2010 — Notification from DFO the Responsible Authority (RA) to other applicable agencies for project review. Agencies given 30 days to provide a response to the RA.
- January 26, 2011 — Submission of SRS's Conceptual Compensation Plan for the Wren Creek development, Mission, B.C.
- June 17, 2011 - Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations (MFLNRO) response regarding wildlife and in particular Oregon forestsnail.

- July 15, 2011 — DFO Response indicating "Based on the above understanding it is DFO's opinion that the proposed fish habitat compensation concepts outlined in the January 26, 2011 SRS report have the potential to provide adequate fish habitat to offset losses of fish habitat of the nature anticipated from the potential development at the subject development site"
- September 1, 2011 — Environment Canada Response concerning wildlife and the Oregon forestsnail in particular.
- September 19, 2011 - MFLNRO additional response to comments regarding Oregon forestsnail and other wildlife submitted by Bianchini Biological Services and Carhoun & Sons Enterprises Ltd. regarding environmental impacts associated with proposed development at Wren St. and Highway 7 in Mission, B.C.
- September 21, 2011 — SRS email to DFO (the RA) concerning MFLNRO response and clarification regarding "In reviewing Joshua's recent comments, he notes that Mr. Carhoun's property is "critical" for Oregon forestsnails? Has critical habitat been identified provincially or federally for OFS? Is Mr. Carhoun's property considered "critical habitat" as defined by federal or provincial legislation? Please clarify".
- September 21, 2011 — SRS email to DFO regarding "following up with you per our conversation last week. You had mentioned that we would be receiving the CEAA Screening Letter this coming Friday. Please forward the letter to Karel Carhoun, Jim Scott and myself for review".
- September 27, 2011 — SRS email response to DFO telecomm response dated September 26, 2011 - SRS requests for follow up on the CEAA process and CEAA Screening Letter. Additionally SRS requests clarification regarding Sub-section 79(2) of the Species At Risk Act (SARA) and its implications to CSE's project concerning "critical habitat", definition of "critical habitat" and provincial jurisdiction over habitat for "species at risk" on private lands and how it relates to our clients project and CEAA Screening?
- October 13, 2011 — Telecomm from DFO regarding project. DFO indicates that EC is providing an additional response with no anticipated date.

Our client has conveyed to SRS that the concern over the Oregon Forestsnail habitat is delaying the CEAA Screening Response Letter and he was also under the understanding that the CEAA review requires that it applies current applicable legislation when being reviewed. **It is SRS's** understanding that critical habitat has not been defined under SARA for Oregon Forestsnail. It is also SRS and our clients understanding that the property is not considered "critical habitat" for Oregon Forestsnail as defined by current federal or provincial legislation; and, the property is on private lands and not Crown Lands where the federal or provincial legislation would apply.

SRS also notes that OFS has been found on various infrastructure projects within the Lower Mainland where salvage and recovery was an acceptable form of mitigation including the Port Mann Twinning Project, South Fraser Perimeter Road and Highway 7 widening to name a few. However, CSE is concerned that the same salvage and recovery strategy has not been considered an acceptable option for their proposed development.

CSE has requested that we provide the above noted details to your office in hopes that the Mayor and Council will be able to provide a written letter from the DoM to Susan Farlinger (DFO Regional Director General, Pacific Region) asking for a reasonable timeline for completion of the CEAA Screening and CEAA Screening Report. CSE would like to see a formal response by October 25, 2011 given the fact that our original EIA submission was in September of 2009.

I trust this is the information you require at this time, please call the undersigned if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

**SCOTT RESOURCE SERVICES INC.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a horizontal stroke at the bottom.

Patrick Ehnes, *R.B.Tech., AScT*  
Project Manager

Cc: Karel Carhoun, CSE  
Jim Scott, SRS



Corporate Administration  
Memorandum

**To:** Chief Administrative Officer  
**From:** Deputy Chief Administrative Officer  
**Date:** October 17, 2011  
**Subject:** **Clarification of Council Remuneration and Expense Policies**

**Recommendation**

No staff recommendation accompanies this report

**Background**

Recently the District has been asked to clarify its policy and practice regarding expenses related to Council. Specifically the type of expenses that are considered part of the one-third income tax exemption of their remuneration by Revenue Canada for elected officials.

The District has a policy that addresses remuneration for Council as well as expenses that will be reimbursed while conducting municipal business. These policies and administration of these policies is consistent with Revenue Canada's policy "P-097R2 Expense Allowances of elected Municipal and School Board Members".

To clarify it has always been the historical intent that expenses incurred within Mission for Council members to serve their constituency form part of the remuneration and not a separate expense. Typically these expenses are for; vehicles costs related to wear and tear, home office expenses, meeting expenses, fees related to attending functions and other similar expenses. In discussions with other municipalities this is a consistent approach.

I have included, for comparative purposes, our neighboring municipalities Council's remuneration and expenses reported for last year.

**Communication**

Staff will consider posting this explanation with the policy on the municipal website

  
Paul Gipps

## **District of Mission**

### **Schedule of Remuneration and Expenses**

For the year ended December 31, 2010	(1) REMUNERATION	(2) EXPENSES	TOTAL
ELECTED OFFICIALS			
Mayor James <del>Albo</del>	\$ 65,771.92	I 5,996.22	71,788.14
Councillor Terry Gidda	23,316.00	3,362.97	26,698.97
Councillor Paul Horn	22,704.00	7.33	22,711.33
Councillor Dane Pieces	23,214.03	2,059.32	25,273.32
Cow ciao, Mike Scudder	22,704.03	1,947.93	24,651.93
Councillor Jenny <del>Stevens</del>	22,704.00	278.00	22,979.00
Councillor Heather Stewart	22,806.00	1,635.29	24,441.29
SUBTOTAL ELECTED OFFICIALS	203,219.92	\$ 15,304.06	\$ 218,523.99

The Corporation of the District of Maple Ridge  
Financial Information Act

Schedule Showing the Remuneration and Expenses  
Paid to or on Behalf of Each Employee  
for 2010

1 Elected Officials

Name	Position	Remuneration	Benefits	Expenses
Ashlie, Cheryl	Councillor	\$ 41,896.86	187.20	3,358.07
Daykin, Ernest	Mayor	98,558.84	1,689.60	3,439.95
Dueck, Judy	Councillor	43,051.80	1,411.20	873.05
Hogarth, Al	Councillor	43,051.79	1,411.20	3,121.80
King, Linda	Councillor	41,800.58	159.90	2,043.63
Morden, Michael	Councillor	43,258.88	1,549.20	2,678.11
Speirs, Craig	Councillor	41,827.89	187.20	5,896.47
Totals		353,446.64	6,595.501	21,411.08

CITY OF ABBOTSFORD - SCHEDULE B  
ABBOTSFORD Elected Officials-Remuneration For 2010

Name	Position	Indemnity	WSC Meetings	Vehicle Benefit	Indemnity •	Expenses	Total
GEORGE PEARY	MAYOR	86,600	816		87,416	13,639	101,056
GIBSON SIMON	COUNCILLOR	34,700	918		35,618		35,618
GILL MOHINDAR	COUNCILLOR	34,700	918		35,618	6,365	41,983
HARRIS LYNNE	COUNCILLOR	35,061	102		35,163	143	35,306
LOEWEN DAVE	COUNCILLOR	37,948			37,948	118	38,066
ROSS PATRICIA	COUNCILLOR	37,948	1,122		39,070	80	39,150
SMITH JOHN	COUNCILLOR	36,504			36,504	77	36,581
LES BARKMAN	COUNCILLOR	34,700			34,700	571	35,271
BILL MACGREGOR	COUNCILLOR	31,719			31,719	695	32,414
		\$ 369,880	\$ 3,876	\$	\$ 373,756	\$ 21,687	\$ 395,443

City of Chilliwack

Schedule of Remuneration and Expenses for Elected Officials  
For the Year Ended December 31, 2010

Councillor	Remuneration Bylaw Rate	Other	Mileage Reimbursement	Expenses
Councillor Susan Attril	26,648.65			3,792.51
Councillor Pat Clark	26,648.65	1,952.44		2,811.67
Mayor Sharon Gaetz	78,097.34		987.48	7,733.83
Councillor Ken Huttema	26,648.65	1,952.44		3,480.71
Councillor Diane Janzen	26,648.65	650.81		3,090.26
Councillor Stewart McLean	26,648.65	1,301.62	215.28	4,951.18
Councillor Chuck Stam	26,648.65	1,952.44	247.97	3,321.39
Total	237,989.24	7,809.75	1,450.73	29,181.55
TOTAL REMUNERATION	\$ 245,798.99			
TOTAL EXPENSES and MILEAGE				\$ 30,632.28