Regular Meeting of Council
Agenda

November 21, 2016

A Regular Meeting of Council will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall at 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, B.C.

Commencing at 1:00 p.m. for Committee of the Whole
Immediately followed by a Closed Council meeting
Reconvening at 7:00 p.m. for Regular Council proceedings

1. CALL TO ORDER (1:00 P.M.)

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

4. FORESTRY
   (a) Forestry Operations 2016 Quarter3 (Q3) Report  
      This report provides a summary of the third quarter financial results for the forestry operation together with additional information on forestry reserves, strategies, plans, activities, and challenges for the remainder of the year.

5. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
   (a) Street naming bylaw in relation to the subdivision of 8502 and 8455 McTaggart Street  
      This report details proposed street names in relation to the subdivision of the properties located at 8502 and 8455 McTaggart Street and identifies the necessary Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.
   (b) Development Permit amendment for the property located at #134 - 32555 London Avenue  
      This report details an amendment to an existing development permit application to facilitate façade improvements to a portion of the a building located at #134 – 32555 London Avenue.
      Staff support the proposed development permit amendment and as such have listed the DPM16-029 under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.
(c) **Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Applications to facilitate a 10-lot subdivision – 8473 & 8511 Judith Street**

This report details the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a ten (10) lot subdivision on the properties located at 8473 and 8511 Judith Street and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amendment Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda. Staff support the development variance permit application, and will list the accompanying Development Variance Permit for Council consideration when the Zoning Amending Bylaw is brought forward for adoption.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for December 5, 2016.

6. **ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS**

(a) **Clean Water and Wastewater Fund Application**

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the following projects be supported for the Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) Grant program as outlined in the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design report dated November 21, 2016:
   
   a) Fraser River Sanitary Crossing project at the Class D cost estimate of $8,310,872 (excluding the required land acquisition at the estimated cost of $300,000 plus GST), with funding for the District’s share of $1,712,848 in accordance with the District’s DCC Bylaw and financial plan, including an internal loan from the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund to the DCC Reserve Fund as required, which is to be repayable by future DCC collections;
   
   b) Water Meter Infrastructure project at the Class D cost estimate of up to $15,500,000, with funding for the District’s share of $2,635,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund;

2. That the required funding for engaging the services of a consultant to assist the District in preparing the application for Item 1.b, at a cost not to exceed $10,000, be funded from the Water Contingency budget, which has a remaining budget of $44,000; and

3. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.
(b) **Fraser Basin Council Request for Funds for Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Council consider and resolve:

That the District contribute $4,000 to the Fraser Basin Council for development of Phase 2 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy, with funding from the existing Drainage Utility – Dyke Maintenance budget.

(c) **Municipal Hall Renovation Budget Amendment**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That the $5,000 funding previously approved for a new workstation for the part-time tax/utility clerk be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation budget;
2. That the $10,000 funding previously approved for the new workstation for the two new positions in Finance and Inspections be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation budget; and
3. That the financial plan be amended accordingly.

(d) **Landfill Operating Contract**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Council consider and resolve:

1. That the 2017-2021 Mission Landfill Operating Contract, in the amount of $857,302 for 2017, be awarded to SSG Holdings Ltd (SSG), including the following additional services:
   a) grinding of dimensional lumber;
   b) mattress recycling at a handling cost of $8.50 per unit, to be offset by a new user fee of $10.00 per unit; and
   c) after-hours site security improvements;
2. That the estimated net budget shortfall of $44,000 be accommodated by a corresponding decrease in the transfer to the Refuse Reserve Fund;
3. That the feasibility and cost of establishing a salvage facility at the landfill be further investigated;
4. That the feasibility and cost of establishing a household hazardous waste facility at the landfill be further investigated; and
5. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

7. **CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE**

(a) **Fall Financial Reporting – September 30, 2016**

The purpose of this report is to brief Council on the current status of the 2016 budget, and provide a projection of the District’s overall financial results to December 31, 2016. This report is provided for information only, no staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.
Delivery of Tourism Services and Formation of an Independent Destination Marketing Organization

The purpose of this report is to provide information about a four-year transitional plan to develop a stand-alone industry managed Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) for the development and delivery of tourism services in Mission.

If Council adopts the staff recommendation noted below, further direction from Council is required as to the preferred funding model, including the desired rate of Municipal and Regional District Tax, and when to implement the DMO considering the near completion of the 2017 budget process.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the establishment of an independent Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) be supported; and
2. That the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce manage the interim administration and formative process of the DMO.

8. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve to rise from Committee of the Whole

9. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE PUBLIC MEETING UNTIL 7:00 P.M. AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 of the Community Charter, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:
   - Section 90(1)(g) of the Community Charter – litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality.
2. That the public portion of the meeting be recessed until 7:00 p.m.; and
3. That Council immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting.

10. RECONVENE (7:00 P.M.)

11. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

(a) Committee of the Whole report dated November 21, 2016

Report of recommendations to be circulated at the 7:00 p.m. reconvened public meeting
12. PRESENTATIONS
   (a) **Staff Service Recognition**
       Kelly Kitsch – Recognition of 20 Years of Service
   (b) **Communities in Bloom**
       Jo Priestley and Bert Pulles will update Council on the Communities in Bloom activities

13. DELEGATIONS
   (a) **Citizens of Cedar Street**
       Re: noise and speed violations on Cedar Street
   (b) **Mark Gervais and Pierre Robinson, Mission Tennis Club**
       Re: addition of a fourth tennis court in Centennial Park

14. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   (a) **Public Hearing Notice for November 21, 2016**
       For reference
   (b) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5595-2016-5050(220)**
       R16-017 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone a portion of the property at 7765 Horne Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone
       Copy of Notice to Owner/Occupant and previous staff report included as background information

15. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES
   (a) **Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting – August 31, 2016**
   (b) **Economic Development Select Committee meeting – September 13, 2016**
   (c) **Cultural Resources Commission meeting – November 4, 2016**

16. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION
   (a) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5608-2016-5050(223)**
       R16-027 (Gill) – a bylaw to rezone the properties located at 8473 and 8511 Judith Street from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone
       See “Development Services” in Section 5(c)
   (b) **Street Naming Bylaw (Adair Avenue, Ewert Avenue Extension, George Street, Jack Crescent) 5611-2016**
       A bylaw to name four new streets in a subdivision
       See “Development Services” in Section 5(a)
(c) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5595-2016-5050(220) **

R16-017 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone a portion of the property at 7765 Horne Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

See “Public Hearings” in Section 14(b)

(d) **Zoning Amending Bylaw 5586-2016-5050(213) **

A bylaw to permit and prohibit certain uses in the Core Commercial Downtown 1 (CCD1) Zone

---

17. **DEVELOPMENT PERMITS FOR CONSIDERATION**

(a) **Development Permit Application DPM16-029 (#134 - 32555 London Avenue)**

Development Permit to supplement District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 as follows:

- Building design and siting plans to be as shown on Drawings Numbered A2.0 and A2.1 inclusive, as attached to Development Permit DPM16-029.

- The said lands shall not be built on and no building shall be constructed, installed or erected on the subject property, unless the building is constructed, installed or erected substantially in accordance with Development Permit DPM16-029 unless approval in writing has been obtained from the Municipality to deviate from the said development plan.

---

18. **COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

RECOMMENDATION: That the minutes of the Regular Council Meeting dated November 7, 2016 be adopted.

---

19. **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

20. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

21. **QUESTION PERIOD**

22. **ADJOURNMENT**
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business
SUBJECT: Forestry Operations 2016 Quarter3 (Q3) Report
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix A – Forestry Operations Detailed Results Quarter 3
Appendix B – Forestry Operations Sales Analysis 2016

This report provides a summary of the third quarter financial results for the forestry operation together with additional information on forestry reserves, strategies, plans, activities, and challenges for the remainder of the year.

PURPOSE:
1. To provide financial results for the forestry operations for Q3 (July 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016) and YTD (January 1, 2016 to September 30, 2016)
2. To provide information on the strategies and plans.
3. To provide the status of the forestry reserves.
4. To provide an update on other forestry activities in Q3.
5. To provide an update on issues for the rest of the year.

BACKGROUND:
Staff has prepared this report regarding financial information for the forestry operations in Q3 of 2016. This budget report includes a comparison of the previous year financial results, status of the forestry reserve and an update on other forestry activities during the quarter.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
1. Financial Results for Q3 2016

The forestry financial results are reporting a Q3 2016 net profit of $267,547 (after fee/fund transfers) compared to the forecasted Q3 2016 budget net loss of $109,560 and Q3 2015 profit of $12,885. Sales revenue for the period was $1,499,421 compared to a budget of $700,060 and Q3 2015 Actual of $917,126. Sales volume of logs through our broker for the quarter was higher by 4,447 m³ against the budget. In addition value was higher by $29.77/ m³ for the quarter.

For the nine months ending September 30, 2016 forestry financial results are reporting a net profit of $1,011,610 (after fee/fund transfers). In the 2016 budget we had forecasted a net profit of $146,478 and in 2015 we had a profit of $186,401 through the end of September.

Table 1 provides a summary of the quarterly results comparing 2015 actual, 2016 budget and 2016 actual. Table 2 provides a summary of the year to date results comparing 2015 actual, 2016 budget and 2016 actual.
Appendix A is a detailed report on the actual results versus budget for the quarter and year to date. Appendix B is an analysis of log sales for the quarter and year to date.

### Table 1: Comparison of 2015 Q3 versus 2016 Budget and 2016 Actual Financial Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Final Budget</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$/m³</td>
<td>$/m³</td>
<td>$/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$ 917,126</td>
<td>$ 102.37</td>
<td>$ 1,499,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Logging Expense</td>
<td>639,934</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>924,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Margin</td>
<td>$ 277,192</td>
<td>$ 30.94</td>
<td>$ 574,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>257,685</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>269,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>37,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit (Loss)</td>
<td>$ 12,885</td>
<td>$ 1.44</td>
<td>$ 267,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Sold</td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>11,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Sale Volume</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volume</td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>11,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Logged</td>
<td>9,801</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>9,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Comparison of 2015 YTD versus 2016 Budget and 2016 Actual Financial Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Final Budget</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$/m³</td>
<td>$/m³</td>
<td>$/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$ 3,502,478</td>
<td>$ 98.05</td>
<td>$ 4,312,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Logging Expense</td>
<td>2,392,582</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>2,409,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Margin</td>
<td>$ 1,109,896</td>
<td>$ 31.07</td>
<td>$ 1,903,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>783,630</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>779,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>139,865</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>112,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit (Loss)</td>
<td>$ 186,401</td>
<td>$ 5.22</td>
<td>$ 1,011,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Sold</td>
<td>31,425</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>27,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Sale Volume</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volume</td>
<td>35,723</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>39,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Logged</td>
<td>36,565</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>41,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Log markets remain strong aided by the lower Canadian Dollar. In the third quarter exports to Asia continue to account for a major portion of log volume sold. In the third quarter a large percentage of the logs sold (34%) were cedar driving revenues higher. For the year 27% of our logs were sold into export markets. Cedar and Fir domestic markets also continue to be extremely strong.

   a. **Log revenue, marketing and sales** – The detailed log sales breakdown, excluding timber sale volume, for the quarter and the year is in Appendix B. The 2016 Q3 log sales revenues were $1,493,931 or $134.87 /m³ against a budget of $676,260 or $102.00/ m³. For the year revenues are averaging just over $126.00/ m³ against a budget of $102.00/ m³.

   b. **Operational costs and Other Expenses** – The detailed breakdown of costs by type are in Appendix A. For the quarter direct logging expenses were higher than forecast as we did not experience any lengthy shut downs resulting from fire weather. Stumpage rates continue to increase and were higher by $1.66m³ in the quarter and our fee in lieu (export tax) was higher by $4.04/ m³ due to increased log exports. Logging production volumes were up 2,873 m³ against budget due to favourable weather and equipment uptime of our logging contractor. Other expenses were $ 10,389 lower than budget in the quarter. Reduced general and silviculture costs were partially offset by higher than budgeted West Stave costs. For the year costs are below budget by $75,164 driven by lower administration, silviculture and vandalism costs.

3. Forestry reserve status

The minimum recommended balance for the Forestry Reserve Fund per the District’s Reserve and Surplus Policy (FIN.42) is $1,000,000 and the optimum balance is $1,500,000. The opening forestry reserve balance as at December 31, 2015 was $1,683,624. The forestry financial results are reporting a 2016 YTD net profit of $1,011,610 (after fee/fund transfers) resulting in a closing forestry reserve balance as at September 30, 2016 of $2,532,685 which includes the purchase of the wildland bush truck and Stave West projects of $31,615 through September.

4. Highlights of other forestry activities in Q3 and remainder of 2016

In addition to our legal forestry obligations and our objective to optimize the financial return on the Tree Farm Licence investment we also manage the forestry operation to meet various recreation, education and community forestry responsibilities. Here is a summary of other forestry activities for Q3:

   a. Completed summer student project along with BCIT and Kwantlen to assist mainly in recreation projects and planning.

   b. Participated in Demo 2106 conference with a tour of international delegates to the tree farm during National Forest week.

   c. Provided 3 hour forestry lesson to students at Zajac Ranch for 50 students.

   d. Continue to work with Kwantlen and Katzie First Nations on the potential land swap.

   e. Duathlon held on Bear and Red Mountain by Fraser Valley Mountain Bike Association.

5. Challenges for the remainder of 2016

   a. The softwood lumber agreement between Canada and the US has not yet been renewed and could cause some disruption in the marketplace especially for domestic products.

   b. Actual harvesting activities for 2016 are complete and crews are working on development for Q1 2017.
c. Our contract with H&C Logging expires at the end of the year. We are required by provincial legislation to offer them a similar contract by the end of the year.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
The forestry financial results are reporting a Q3 2016 net profit of $267,547 (after fee/fund transfers) and a YTD net profit of $1,011,610 resulting in a closing forestry reserve balance as of September 30, 2016 of approximately $2,532,685. The forecast for the fourth quarter of the year is a loss of approximately $117,500 resulting in a net profit to the end of 2016 of $981,863 and a forecasted closing forestry reserve balance of approximately $2,412,384. The forestry final budget for 2016 projected a net profit of $196,000.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services

COMMUNICATION:
No communication action is required.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The forestry financial results are reporting a Q3 2016 net profit of $267,547 (after fee/fund transfers) and a YTD net profit of $1,011,610. The financial performance in Q3 is due primarily to the strong log markets driven by increased demand for lumber products and favourable foreign exchange rates.

SIGN-OFFS:

Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business

Reviewed by:
Bob O'Neal, Director of Forestry

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
## Appendix A - Forestry Operations Detailed Results Quarter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 Final Budget</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Final Budget</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Final</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>YTD Final</td>
<td>YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue or cost per m³</td>
<td>Revenue or cost per m³</td>
<td>Revenue or cost per m³</td>
<td>Revenue or cost per m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log sales revenue</td>
<td>$676,260</td>
<td>$1,493,931</td>
<td>$2,703,000</td>
<td>$3,412,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$134.87</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>$126.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log sales revenue Timber Sales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>876,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>68.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>61,800</td>
<td>23,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>700,060</td>
<td>1,499,421</td>
<td>3,244,800</td>
<td>4,312,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105.59</td>
<td>135.36</td>
<td>84.28</td>
<td>107.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct logging expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Logging</td>
<td>208,127</td>
<td>387,822</td>
<td>831,879</td>
<td>1,066,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.39</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>106.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS Contract</td>
<td>65,736</td>
<td>98,264</td>
<td>262,748</td>
<td>310,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumpage</td>
<td>91,163</td>
<td>146,477</td>
<td>529,375</td>
<td>640,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Roads</td>
<td>33,150</td>
<td>30,988</td>
<td>131,831</td>
<td>136,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>32,983</td>
<td>40,133</td>
<td>113,167</td>
<td>116,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>19,634</td>
<td>23,679</td>
<td>78,478</td>
<td>61,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>13,984</td>
<td>19,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Log Sales</td>
<td>26,520</td>
<td>29,384</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>77,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing , FIL</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>54,228</td>
<td>111,572</td>
<td>101,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventory Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(108,478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct logging expenses</td>
<td>491,852</td>
<td>924,955</td>
<td>2,130,925</td>
<td>2,409,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>79.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin</td>
<td>208,208</td>
<td>574,926</td>
<td>1,113,875</td>
<td>1,903,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>47.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>123,023</td>
<td>148,087</td>
<td>369,068</td>
<td>347,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviculture</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>6,142</td>
<td>135,384</td>
<td>103,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>11,719</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>55,302</td>
<td>62,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Stave</td>
<td>28,707</td>
<td>59,594</td>
<td>85,483</td>
<td>99,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>31,788</td>
<td>29,534</td>
<td>48,432</td>
<td>57,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrols &amp; Vandalism</td>
<td>38,217</td>
<td>41,272</td>
<td>69,163</td>
<td>20,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>12,001</td>
<td>(9,504)</td>
<td>30,002</td>
<td>4,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Interpretive Forest</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(18,510)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>12,657</td>
<td>36,575</td>
<td>27,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>280,105</td>
<td>269,716</td>
<td>854,409</td>
<td>779,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net profit (loss) before transfers</td>
<td>71,897 (10.84)</td>
<td>305,210 (27.55)</td>
<td>259,467 (6.74)</td>
<td>1,124,599 (28.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to non-forestry reserves</td>
<td>37,663 (5.68)</td>
<td>37,663 (3.40)</td>
<td>112,989 (2.93)</td>
<td>112,989 (2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net profit (loss)</td>
<td>$ (109,560)</td>
<td>$ 267,547</td>
<td>$ 146,478</td>
<td>$ 1,011,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(16.52)</td>
<td>$ 24.15</td>
<td>$ 3.80</td>
<td>$ 25.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin percentage</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (m³) Logs Sold</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>11,077</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>27,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,069</td>
<td>29,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (m³) Production</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>9,503</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>27,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,069</td>
<td>29,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (m³) Timber Sales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Actual

2016 Final Budget

2016 Actual

2016 Final Budget
## Appendix B: Forestry Operations Sales Analysis 2016
### Quarter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
<th>Hemlock</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ce Cns</td>
<td>603.2</td>
<td>118.99</td>
<td>Fir Export SL</td>
<td>329.2</td>
<td>125.68</td>
<td>Hem CNS L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Gang</td>
<td>2438.1</td>
<td>224.92</td>
<td>Fir #2 Japan 12”</td>
<td>588.8</td>
<td>115.12</td>
<td>Hem China Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Merch</td>
<td>433.4</td>
<td>242.10</td>
<td>Fir Ppr</td>
<td>265.9</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>Hem China Std Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Poles</td>
<td>243.8</td>
<td>258.49</td>
<td>Fir Ppr facestock</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>198.31</td>
<td>Hem Korea Std Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Utility SL</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>Fir Japan Perm 12”</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>Hem Pulp Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Utility</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>69.65</td>
<td>Hem Korea Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hem/Fir Piling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hem Japan Gang Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hem Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hem China 20”+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hem CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boomsticks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Total</td>
<td>3,735.0</td>
<td>211.42</td>
<td>Fir Total</td>
<td>1,438.9</td>
<td>121.66</td>
<td>Hem Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Species</td>
<td>11,077.1</td>
<td>134.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort</th>
<th>Cedar</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
<th>Fir</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
<th>Hemlock</th>
<th>$/m³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ce Cns</td>
<td>1242.9</td>
<td>119.11</td>
<td>Fi Ppr OG</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>120.75</td>
<td>Hem CNS L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Gang</td>
<td>3609.0</td>
<td>223.63</td>
<td>Fir CnS</td>
<td>582.4</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>Hem Exp SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Merch</td>
<td>538.8</td>
<td>241.15</td>
<td>Fir Ex Prem</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>125.75</td>
<td>Hem Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Shingle</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>Fir Export SL</td>
<td>516.0</td>
<td>124.49</td>
<td>Hem Gang Ppr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Utility</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>100.82</td>
<td>Fir #2 Japan 12”</td>
<td>1213.7</td>
<td>114.91</td>
<td>Hem China Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Poles</td>
<td>582.3</td>
<td>263.06</td>
<td>Fir OS</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>140.75</td>
<td>Hem China Std Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce Utility SL</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>99.63</td>
<td>Fir Ppr</td>
<td>2832.6</td>
<td>100.16</td>
<td>Hem Korea Std Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Export 20”+</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>Hem Pulp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Poles</td>
<td>543.2</td>
<td>151.10</td>
<td>Hem Pulp Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Japan Perm 20”</td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>Hem Pulp Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir pulp</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>Hem Korea Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Lumber</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>Hem/Fir Piling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Ppr facestock</td>
<td>1233.7</td>
<td>149.93</td>
<td>Hem Japan Gang Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Sawlog</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>189.49</td>
<td>Hem Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Ex Gang (J)</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>134.89</td>
<td>Hem China 20”+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Japan Perm 12”</td>
<td>295.3</td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td>Ba Gang Peeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Japan SL</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>162.91</td>
<td>Ba Japan Prem 12”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fir Utility</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>69.65</td>
<td>Hem CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boomsticks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Total</td>
<td>6,135.8</td>
<td>204.82</td>
<td>Fir Total</td>
<td>8,263.0</td>
<td>118.73</td>
<td>Hem Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Species</td>
<td>27,077.84</td>
<td>126.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Robert Publow, Planner
SUBJECT: Street naming bylaw in relation to the subdivision of 8502 and 8455 McTaggart Street
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Proposed Subdivision Layout with proposed street names

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8502 and 8455 McTaggart Street
APPLICANT: Gary Toor and Jason Tiegen on behalf of Colin and Catharine Jack, Mil-Kai Investments Ltd. and Kartar Holdings Ltd.

OCP: This application is in conformance with the current OCP designation of Urban Residential.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: February 26, 2015
LOCATION: Hatzic
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details proposed street names in relation to the subdivision of the properties located at 8502 and 8455 McTaggart Street and identifies the necessary Street Naming Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

SUMMARY

The related development application involves the creation of 58 residential lots with a minimum 669 square metres (7,200 square feet) lot area. The rezoning was adopted by Council on May 16, 2016, however consideration of appropriate street names was deferred until a later date.

STREET NAMING (Policy STR.28 – Street Naming)

In accordance with Council Policy STR.28, street naming of three new roads are required and one road is required to be extended. Staff recommend that the required roads be named as detailed below and as shown in Appendix 2:

Jack Crescent

That the proposed road east of Hatzic Park which generally runs north-south and connects to McTaggart Street, be named “Jack Crescent” in honour of the Jack’s family, pioneer and long-time resident of Hatzic.

- Mr. Milton Jack was born in 1877 in Chateauguay, Quebec and died in 1964 and Mrs. Jack was born in 1882 and died in 1980.
- Milton and son Wilfred are the founders of Ferncliff Gardens on McTaggart Street in Hatzic. It was originally a raspberry farm, but they turned it into a flowers and bulbs farm specializing in dahlias and gladiolus. They shipped bulbs all over Canada, US, England, Australia and New Zealand. They have won many awards at rural fairs and city exhibitions.
- Mrs. Jack was very active in the community. Some of her activities include being a member of Mission School Board – she was the first woman in the Hatzic area to serve as chairman on the board of school trustees, instrumental role in establishing the regional library service, charter member (president) of the Mission – Abbotsford University women’s club she was also active in united church organizations.
- Wilfred was also active in the community. He was a school trustee for 13 years and 8 years as chairman of the board – received an honour certificate for having served over 10 years as a trustee. He was a Reeve in Mission, chairman of both the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board and Fraser Valley Regional Library, vice-president of Fraser Valley Municipal Associate and director of Mission Memorial Hospital

Adair Avenue

That the proposed continuous east-west thoroughfares off of McTaggart Street which will be connected to McTaggart Street north of Jack Crescent, be named “Adair Avenue”, in honour of the Adair’s family, pioneer and long-time residents of Mission.

- Lorna was born in North Battleford, Saskatchewan in 1931. She went to St. Paul’s School of Nursing and graduated in 1953. Lorna dies in 2011.
- Doug Adair was born June 16, 1930, dies May 8, 2012.
- Doug and Lorna met in Williams Lake and married in 1954 and moved to Mission where they had 4 children
- Doug served in the Canadian Army from 1946 – 51, died in 2012
- 1954 – Doug worked for the Canadian Bank of Commerce
- 1955 – Doug was elected president of Mission Junior Chamber of Commerce
- 1955 – Doug was elected new president of local Jaycees
- 1959 – Lorna was installed as president of the Kinettes
- 1966 – Doug elected chairman of District 75 Board of School Trustees
- 1973 – Lorna was re-elected to Parks and Recreation Commission
- 1974 – Doug elected president of the associated Credit Bureaus of BC
- 1975 – Lorna was one of the founders of the first District of Mission Arts Council Incorporated
- 1975 – Lorna was honoured for her service in the community
- 1980 – Lorna was president of the Pleasant View Housing Society
- 1986 – Doug and Lorna went to Papua New Guinea for a 3 year commission to work for the United Church in the area
- Doug was an Alderman in Mission
- Lorna was also a nurse in Mission and taught part-time at the College in the Homemaker Program, Doug served with distinction as secretary – treasurer of the Valemount Group of Companies and latterly as Vice-President Administration with Acrofax Inc.
- Doug was on the Mission Memorial Hospital Board; member of the Upper Fraser Valley Health Board
- Awards: 1995 – Lorna Pleasant View Housing Society Honourary Life Membership; Doug was a Rotarian and was president of Rotary Foundation and received the Paul Harris Award for his outstanding service to the Mission club and community

George Street

That the proposed road running north-south, terminating at Adair Avenue to the north and Ewert Avenue to the south, be named George Street in honour of World War II veteran Gilbert Llewellyn George, who was a Flight Sergeant with the RCAF 53 Squadron as an Air Gunner.

Ewert Avenue

That the proposed road section extending in a westerly direction from the east end of Ewert Avenue connecting with McTaggart Street be considered an extension of Ewert Avenue, and that the proposed new road section, running north-east from the southern terminus of George Street be named Ewert Avenue as a continuation of Ewert Avenue. These two proposed new sections of Ewert Avenue are anticipated to be connected by a subsequent development proposal.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING

The Final Reading of the amending bylaws will be held until the following have been satisfied:

1. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

SIGN-OFFS:

Robert Publow, Planner

Reviewed by:
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning & Special Projects

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1
Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8455 McTaggart Street
PID: 016-788-648
Legal: Lot 2 Section 25 and 26 Township 17 and District Lot 476 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 87417

Civic Address: 8502 McTaggart Street
PID: 009-747-532
Legal: Lot A District Lot 476 Group 1 and Section 25 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12639
Appendix 2

Proposed Subdivision Layout with proposed street names

Jack Crescent
Adair Avenue
George Street
Ewert Avenue
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Robert Publow, Planner
SUBJECT: Development Permit amendment for the property located at #134 - 32555 London Avenue
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Front (North) elevation
Appendix 4 – Side (East) elevation
Appendix 5 – Rear (South) elevation

CIVIC ADDRESS: #134 – 32555 London Avenue
APPLICANT: Joy Roque of Lovick Scott Architects Ltd.
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Commercial OCP designation.
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: September 9, 2016
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details an amendment to an existing development permit application to facilitate façade improvements to a portion of the a building located at #134 – 32555 London Avenue.

Staff support the proposed development permit amendment and as such have listed the DPM16-029 under the “Development Permits for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

BACKGROUND

A development permit was issued on June 1, 1998, DP98-002, to approve the form and character of the subject building along with several other buildings that form a large portion of ‘the Junction’ shopping centre.

SUMMARY

An application has been received from Joy Roque of Lovick Scott Architects Ltd., to undertake exterior renovations of #134 – 32555 London Avenue (Appendix 2) on behalf of the tenant of the building unit Wendy’s Restaurants of Canada.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Development Permit Area D– Lougheed Highway Corridor Area Development Permit Area

A Development Permit for building form and character is required for all significant alterations to buildings within the Lougheed Highway Corridor Area Development Permit Area. The Official Community Plan (OCP) establishes guidelines for the form and character of the development intended to ensure a high quality and attractive form of commercial development, with attention given to streetscape views from the adjacent highways. Development Permit Area D has been designated in the OCP to respond to this objective, noting that by encouraging adherence to professionally designed developments, individual site aesthetics and continuity along the highway corridor can be enhanced.

This proposed façade improvements are consistent with the character and scale of the highway corridor area and the architectural design is suitable for this development permit area. The updated elevation drawings for the front, side and rear of the building are attached as Appendix 1, 2 and 3.

The proposed updates to the building façade include the replacement of existing decorative tiles with two types of pre-finished metal panels. One material is a corrugated metal panel finished in Dark Bronze and the second material is a smooth finish metal panel painted Wendy’s exterior red. Existing stucco wall sections will be updated by painting them Wendy’s dark bronze.

The proposal also includes updates to the existing building mounted signage, as shown in Appendix 1, 2 and 3.

No changes to parking, landscaping and/or pylon signage have been proposed with this application.
COMMUNICATION

A notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 10 metres (30 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

SIGN-OFFS

Robert Publow, Planner

Reviewed by:
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning & Special Projects

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: #134 – 32555 London Avenue

PID: 024-998-991

Legal: Lot 1 District Lot 165 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan LMP49493
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: #134 - 32555 London Avenue

Owner: Mission Valley Shopping Centre Ltd

Applicant: Joy Roque for Lovick Scott Architects Ltd

Zoning: CH2

OCP Designation: Commercial
Appendix 3

Front (North) elevation
Appendix 4

Side (East) elevation
Appendix 5

Rear (South) elevation
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Wesley Woo, Planner
SUBJECT: Rezoning and Development Variance Permit Applications to facilitate a 10-lot subdivision – 8473 & 8511 Judith Street
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer
Appendix 2 – Location Map
Appendix 3 – Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4 – Engineering Department Rezoning Comments
Appendix 5 – Site Plan for Proposed Development Variance Permit

CIVIC ADDRESSES: 8473 & 8511 Judith Street

APPLICANT: Rob Gill
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Residential OCP designation

DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: October 24, 2016
LOCATION:
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS:

This report details the rezoning and development variance permit applications to allow a ten (10) lot subdivision on the properties located at 8473 and 8511 Judith Street and identifies the necessary amendment to the Zoning Bylaw.

Staff support the rezoning application moving forward and as such have listed the Zoning Amendment Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda where the accompanying Development Variance Permit will be listed for Council consideration under the “New/Other Business” section of the agenda at the time of adoption of the Zoning Amendment Bylaw.

Staff support the development variance permit application.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for December 5, 2016.

SUMMARY:

Rezoning, subdivision and development variance permit applications have been received from Rob Gill, applicant, for the properties located at 8473 and 8511 Judith Street (Appendix 2). The application proposes to rezone the subject property from Suburban 36 Zone (S36) to Urban Residential 465 Zone (R465) to facilitate a ten (10) lot subdivision, as shown in Appendix 3.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

The two subject properties together total approximately 0.7812 hectares (1.93 acres) in size and are located in the Cedar Valley neighbourhood on Judith Street, north of Cherry Avenue. The properties are designated Urban Residential in the Official Community Plan (OCP) and are within the Suburban 36 Zone (S36). Both properties are developed with a single family dwelling with large yards. The applicant has indicated that the existing homes are to be retained as part of the subdivision. The land is relatively flat with no watercourses indicated from the District’s mapping system.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Compliance:

The subject properties are currently designated Urban Residential in the OCP and are zoned S36. The proposal for a rezoning to the R465 Zone would accommodate the future subdivision of the land. The proposed R465 Zone allows for a combination of Type I lots which require a minimum of 558m² (6,005 ft²) and Type II lots which require a minimum of 465m² (5,005 ft²). A maximum of 40% of the total lots in any one development are allowed to be Type II lots. In this case, the applicant is proposing a total of four (4) Type II lots out of the ten (10) proposed lots, meeting the maximum 40%.

The proposed rezoning conforms to the OCP to provide for a variety of residential lifestyle options in Mission.

Neighbourhood Character:

The subject property is located within Phase 1 of the Cedar Valley Comprehensive Development Plan (CVCDP). The surrounding lands have seen some redevelopment as a result of the CVCDP. Specifically, lands to the west are developed with a mix of smaller urban residential and urban compact residential lots. Lands immediately to the north, south and east consist of larger urban and suburban lots and have not yet been developed under the CVCDP.
As the road network gets constructed, it is expected that development will continue to fill out the neighbourhood as identified in the CVCDP. Albert McMahon Elementary School is located west of the proposed development. The ten (10) lot subdivision will fit within the context of the ongoing development pattern from the west.

**Servicing:**

Municipal water and sanitary sewer are available on Judith Street. As such, no upgrades are required. Municipal storm sewer is not available on Judith Street. The applicant will be required to bring storm sewer service to the development.

Judith Street provides paved access to the site. Upgrading of Judith Street and Sylvia Avenue to a municipal standard will be required at the time of subdivision. The proposed Peebles Drive extension is to match the existing road cross section to the west.

**Tree Retention:**

In accordance with Council Policy LAN. 32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of 20 trees, two (2) trees for each of the ten (10) lots created. This condition will be met as part of the subdivision approval. In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant trees (trees having a calliper of 0.2 m or greater) that will be removed except in the areas defined as (a) building envelope to a maximum of 2,000 m² (21,528 ft²), (b) driveways, (c) septic field and (d) wells.

**Parks and Trails:**

The subject properties are located in close proximity to a neighbourhood park, approximately 300 metres to Griner Park.

Provisions of the *Local Government Act* authorize a local government to receive up to 5% land or cash-in-lieu contribution for parkland. The OCP has not identified parkland on the subject property. As such, the municipality has no interest in parkland and therefore 5% parkland cash in lieu will be collected prior to the completion of the subdivision.

**Community Amenity Contribution** (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities):

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $22,520 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new facilities and/or amenities.

**DEVELOPMENT VARIANCE PERMIT** (Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009)

The application seeks to vary one Zoning Bylaw regulation in order to retain the existing residence at 8473 Judith Street. The requested variance is for proposed Lot 1 and seeks to vary Section 501 Urban Residential Zones, Part D. Setbacks, Subsection 1 of the Zoning Bylaw, by reducing the minimum rear lot line setback to a Principal Dwelling from 7.5 metres (24.6 feet) to 6.5 metres (21.3 feet).

The proposed variance is being requested on the future corner lot (proposed lot 1). This will minimize the impact of the reduced setback because the orientation of the house will face Judith Street (even though the lot’s front lot line will be located off of Peebles Drive). As a result, the existing house still has an adequate front yard, rear yard and side yards, as shown in Appendix 5. The accompanying rezoning and subdivision applications ensure that the subject property still has further subdivision potential to create two lots.
COMMUNICATION:
In accordance with Land Use Application Procedures and Fees Bylaw 3612-2003, the developer has posted two (2) development notification signs on the site summarizing the proposed development.
Provided that a public hearing date is determined by Council:

1. The development notification sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e. date, time and place) and a notice will be mailed to the owners and occupiers of all properties within a radius of 152 metres (500 ft.) from the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.
2. A notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act
3. A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and is available online or at municipal hall for public viewing (in accordance with Policy LAN. 50 – Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages).

REFERRALS:
Engineering
The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of engineering servicing requirements as outlined in Appendix 4.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL READING:
The Final Reading of the Zoning Amending Bylaw will be held until the following have been satisfied:
1. Collection of any volunteered contributions to the District’s community amenities reserve; and
2. Any other requirements resulting from Council’s consideration of the Bylaw and Public Hearing submissions.

SIGN-OFFS:

Wesley Woo, Planner

Reviewed by:
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer
Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 8473 Judith Street
PID: 005-468-159
Legal: Lot 58 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 56771

Civic Address: 8511 Judith Street
PID: 000-859-532
Legal: Lot 59 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 56771
Appendix 2

Location Map

Subject Property: 8473 & 8511 Judith Street
Owner: Ivon Gill & Sukhwinder Basrom
Applicant: Rob Gill
Zoning: S36
OCP Designation: Urban Residential
Appendix 3

Proposed Subdivision Plan
Appendix 4

Engineering Department Rezoning Comments

September 19, 2016

CIVIC ADDRESS: 8472 & 8511 Judith Street

CURRENT ZONE: S36  PROPOSED ZONE: R465 Type I & R465 Type II

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Judith Street. No upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Judith Street. No updates are required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is not available on Judith Street. Will be required to bring storm sewer service to the development via two options (based on the draft plan submitted);

Option 1 – extend existing storm main on Sylvia to the east and then southwards on Judith Street to southern extent of development.

Option 2 – Discuss with neighbors of adjacent property to the west and enter into a statutory right of way agreement for a utilities corridor coming from Peebles Drive.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:

- Judith Street provides paved access to the site. Upgrading of Judith Street and Sylvia Avenue (at extents of development frontage) to a municipal standard will be required at the time of subdivision.
- The proposed Peebles Street extension is to match the existing road cross section to the west.
- According to the Draft Plan B it appears as though a 10m wide half road is not achievable within the applicants’ land parcels area beyond lots 8 & 2. As such (and the draft plan indicates this) an SRW from the neighboring property would be required to construct lots 3, 4 & 5.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the application may proceed to third reading.

Prepared by:  
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:  
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
Appendix 5

Proposed Development Variance Permit

Existing house fronts onto Judith Street

Front lot line

Rear lot line

Variance to rear setback
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Planning and Design
SUBJECT: Clean Water and Wastewater Fund Application
ATTACHMENTS: Appendix A - Fraser River Sanitary Crossing Project Summary
Appendix B - Water Meter Installation Project Summary

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the following projects be supported for the Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) Grant program as outlined in the Manager of Engineering Planning and Design report dated November 7, 2016:
   a. Fraser River Sanitary Crossing project at the Class D cost estimate of $8,310,872 (excluding the required land acquisition at the estimated cost of $300,000 plus GST), with funding for the District’s share of $1,712,848 in accordance with the District’s DCC Bylaw and financial plan, including an internal loan from the Sewer Capital Reserve Fund to the DCC Reserve Fund as required, which is to be repayable by future DCC collections;
   b. Water Meter Infrastructure project at the Class D cost estimate of up to $15,500,000, with funding for the District’s share of $2,635,000 from the Water Capital Reserve Fund;
2. That the required funding for engaging the services of a consultant to assist the District in preparing the application for Item 1.b, at a cost not to exceed $10,000, be funded from the Water Contingency budget, which has a remaining budget of $44,000; and
3. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to recommend two projects to Council for submission of applications for funding under the CWWF.

BACKGROUND:
The program launch of the Canada - British Columbia Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) was announced on September 30, 2016. The CWWF will support the rehabilitation of local government drinking water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure, and the planning and design of future facilities and upgrades to existing systems.

The fund will primarily focus investments on meeting immediate priorities for clean water and wastewater to support a cleaner and healthier environment for communities. These include:

- The rehabilitation and optimization of water, wastewater and stormwater-related infrastructure;
- Improvement of asset management approaches including studies and pilot projects;
• Planning for future upgrades to wastewater treatment and collection infrastructure to meet applicable regulatory requirements; and

• New construction projects, including the construction of naturalized systems for management and treatment of wastewater and stormwater may also be considered if they can be completed within the program time-frame.

The deadline for submitting project applications online is November 23, 2016. All local governments are eligible to apply to this program. Municipalities may submit two applications. The applications may be for either two capital projects, or one capital and one planning project.

Applications for funding will be evaluated on the extent to which the project meets the following program objectives:

• Increased Capacity or Lifespan of the Asset (Economic Growth);

• Improved Environmental Outcomes (Clean Environment); and

• Enhanced Service (Building Stronger Communities).

It is expected that there will be more projects that qualify for funding than there are program funds available. Consequently, eligible projects will be ranked according to the extent to which they meet the program’s objectives and the eligibility criteria.

Cost Sharing and Limits to Funding Award

The CWWF program offers funding up to a maximum of 83% of the total eligible project costs; 50% is contributed by the Government of Canada, and 33% by the Province of British Columbia. The remaining eligible project costs (17% or higher), plus all ineligible projects costs, are the responsibility of the municipality.

Eligible Project Categories

Drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater projects are eligible under the CWWF. The construction completion date of these projects is to be no later than March 31, 2018, however the approving Minister has some flexibility in potentially extending the deadline for incurring eligible costs to March 2019 if clear rationale is provided with the project application.

Project Ranking

Project applications will be mainly evaluated based on how well the project meets the federal and provincial program objectives of Increased Capacity or Lifespan of the Asset (Economic Growth), Improved Environmental Outcomes (Clean Environment), and Enhanced Service (Building Stronger Communities).

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Staff reviewed the fund criteria and identified two key strategic projects for Council’s consideration. These projects are briefly listed below.

1. **Capital Infrastructure Project #1 - Fraser River Sanitary Crossing**

   This project is eligible under the “new construction project”.

   Mission discharges its wastewater to the Joint Abbotsford Mission Environmental Systems (JAMES) plant through a 600 mm river-crossing pipe for treatment.

   The existing river crossing is a pressurized pipe that lies at the Fraser River bed and was built in 1983. There are capacity and environmental safety concerns with the existing river crossing pipe.
Population growth projection suggests that the District needs to build its second river crossing pipe within the next four to five years. The structural condition of the existing river crossing pipe is unknown. Having the twin sanitary crossing will facilitate performing relatively inexpensive structural condition assessment by emptying one siphon and redirecting wastewater flows to the other one, thus increasing the operational safety of the system. Appendix A provides a more detailed summary of this project. The current estimated total cost of this project is $8,610,872, of which $8,310,872 is eligible for CWWF funding.

2. **Project #2: Water Meter Infrastructure Project**

This project will focus on the funding priority which relates to the optimization of water infrastructure. Additionally, two of the CWWF objectives would be addressed through this project: increased capacity of an asset and improved environmental outcomes.

Water conservation is essential for maximizing use of existing infrastructure and utilizing existing supply sources in a sustainable manner. One of the most effective tools of a water conservation program is metering of customer water usage, as many other conservation initiatives depend on the ability to measure water use. The Water Meter Infrastructure project will include the supply and installation of water meters for all customers on the municipal water system, along with the accompanying hardware and software requirements needed to implement an effective monitoring and billing program. Project details are further outlined in Attachment #2. The overall cost of this project is estimated to be in the order of $12.5 to $15.5 million, however this estimate will be further refined prior to submitting the application. A requirement of the grant application is that Council provide a resolution committing to its share of the eligible and ineligible costs. While the cost estimate will be looked at in more detail, staff recommend that the resolution reference the higher end of the estimated range to ensure all costs are captured within the grant application.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**

Both of the proposed projects would support several of Council’s Values, as outlined in the Strategic Plan. Most specifically, they would demonstrate that the District is:

- **Future Focused:** committed to planning for future generations;
- **Committed to Sustainability:** through a balance of environmental, financial, and operational sustainability; and
- **Looking to provide quality Service to its residents:** through continual system improvements.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

A CWWF grant can fund up to 83% of eligible costs of an eligible project, and the District would need to fund the remaining 17%.

The application documents for the Fraser River Sanitary Crossing project will be prepared in-house by staff.

In order to prepare a compelling application for the Water Meter Infrastructure Project, the District has retained a consultant to prepare the required documents for the application. The estimated cost of the consultant services to assist in preparing the project details required for the application are up to $10,000, and are proposed to be funded from the Water Contingency budget, which has remaining funds of $44,000.

The following table details the Class D cost estimate for each project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost in 2017 Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraser River Sanitary Crossing</strong></td>
<td>CWWF Eligible Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction/Materials</td>
<td>$6,301,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design/Engineering (15% of the construction cost)</td>
<td>$945,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment/First Nations Negotiations</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$1,029,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Eligible Project Costs</strong></td>
<td>$8,310,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWWF Ineligible Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Acquisitions*</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Ineligible Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs (Eligible + Ineligible):</strong></td>
<td>$8,610,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Maximum Grant Amount (Provincial 33% + Federal Share 50%)</strong></td>
<td>$6,898,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District’s Minimum Required Contribution (including the land acquisition cost)</strong></td>
<td>$1,712,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost in 2017 Dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Meter Infrastructure Project</strong></td>
<td>CWWF Eligible Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Eligible Project Costs</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWWF Ineligible Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ineligible Project Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs (Eligible + Ineligible):</strong></td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Maximum Grant Amount (Provincial 33% + Federal Share 50%)</strong></td>
<td>$12,865,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District’s Minimum Required Contribution</strong></td>
<td>$2,635,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - The District must fund land costs, as the CWWF does not consider them eligible costs.

The Fraser River Crossing Siphon project has been identified in the District’s Development Cost Charge (DCC) bylaw as 100% growth related. The District’s required contribution of $1,712,848 would come 99% from the DCC reserve, and 1% from the Sewer Capital Reserve fund, in accordance with the District’s DCC Bylaw and financial plan. There is only about $200,000 available in the DCC reserve at this time. There is over $8 million in the Sewer Capital Reserve fund that is currently available, so it could provide an internal loan to the DCC reserve, to be paid back from future DCC collections.

The water meter infrastructure project is not currently included in the District’s capital plan due to the significant cost. However, as confirmed by the District’s recent water meter pilot study, water meters are a critical tool to manage costs and water usage. The District’s share of the estimated $15.5 million project is $2,635,000, which could be funded from the District’s Water Capital Reserve Fund, which has an available balance in excess of $13 million.
Staff will report back to Council on the CWWF grant application results.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:
Staff will apply for the grant application by the deadline. No further communication is required at this time.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
The Canada - British Columbia Clean Water and Wastewater Fund (CWWF) was announced on September 30, 2016. The fund will primarily focus investments on meeting immediate priorities for clean water and wastewater to support a cleaner and healthier environment for communities. The deadline for submitting project applications online is November 23, 2016. The CWWF program offers funding up to a maximum of 83% of the total eligible project costs; 50% is contributed by the Government of Canada, and 33% by the Province of British Columbia. The remaining eligible project costs (17% or higher), plus all ineligible projects costs, are the responsibility of the municipality. As municipalities may submit two applications, staff recommend that applications be submitted for the Fraser River Sanitary Crossing project and the Water Meter Infrastructure project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Hirod Gill, Manager of Engineering Planning and Design

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
APPENDIX A

Fraser River Sanitary Crossing Project Summary

The Fraser River Sanitary Crossing project encompasses the following main details:

- **Background:**
  - Existing single 600 mm river crossing from Mission to the JAMES plant was built in 1983
    - Pipe is undersized and nearing capacity
    - Unable to inspect current condition of the pipe as it cannot be taken offline
    - Current capacity is increased by discharging to a lower elevation at the JAMES plant, but this results in additional cost due to extra pumping
      - This process provides approximately 4-5 years of adequate capacity
  - Project was originally to be part of the Development Cost Charges program
    - Delays in the Genstar Silverdale developments will result in insufficient funds being collected for the sanitary sewer river crossing project prior to it being required

- **Scope of the project:**
  - Twinning of the existing sanitary sewer crossing of the Fraser River with a 750 mm pipe, approximately 1 km in length, from Mission to the JAMES waste water treatment plant

- **Objectives and benefits of the project:**
  - Reduce the environmental risk of the existing pipe
    - Currently unable to inspect the existing pipe, as there is an extremely high risk associated with blocking the pipe
    - A second river crossing would allow for a condition assessment of the existing pipe, thus reducing the risk of pipe breaks and leakage of raw sewage into the Fraser River
  - Increase the capacity of the sanitary trunk system, allowing for further development within Mission
APPENDIX B

Water Meter Installation Project Summary

The Water Meter Infrastructure Project encompasses the following main details:

- **Scope of the project:**
  - Installation of water meters for un-metered customers on the District’s municipal water system (approximately 9,000 meters)
  - Installation of data transmission and collection infrastructure
  - Hardware and software upgrades to allow for regular billing

- **Objectives and benefits of the project:**
  - Support water conservation initiatives through increased customer awareness
  - Increase available supply capacity through reductions in demand
  - Reduce the need to construct additional water supply infrastructure
  - Provide equitable billing for customers
  - Monitor and assess consumption patterns
  - Identify system and customer leaks
  - Reduce sanitary sewer flows
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services
SUBJECT: Fraser Basin Council Request for Funds for Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy

ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix A – Flood Strategy Letter
Appendix B – Phase 1 Summary Report
Appendix C – October 19 briefing note

RECOMMENDATION: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the District contribute $4,000 to the Fraser Basin Council for development of Phase 2 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy, with funding from the existing Drainage Utility – Dyke Maintenance budget.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Fraser Basin Council (FBC) approached the District of Mission in 2014 to contribute funds towards their proposed flood management strategy, now referred to as the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy (Strategy). The Strategy’s short term objectives are to project water levels for multiple flood scenarios, analyze the region-wide flood risk and consequences, and assess the regional flood protection works, bylaws and floodplain management. Mission is already contributing some funds to the study through their base contribution to the FBC via the Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD) and contributed additional funds of $2,000 in 2015. While the Strategy’s objectives will likely assist in securing flood protection infrastructure funds, staff do not believe that Mission’s inclusion in the Strategy will necessarily ensure that more funding will come to Mission in the future, and would not preclude Mission from having access to the completed project’s recommendations. Nevertheless, there is value in Mission participating in the project in terms of collaborating with the jurisdictions across the Lower Mainland to demonstrate a united front to senior governments that the flood protection issue needs to be taken seriously. The FBC has once again approached the District to request a nominal contribution of $4,000 over the next two years in support of Phase 2 of the Strategy, and would recognize Mission as a full partner in this project.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to update Council with respect to the FBC’s Strategy and to let Council know that a financial contribution has been requested in support of Phase 2 of the Strategy.

BACKGROUND:
The FBC is a charitable non-profit organization that brings people together to advance sustainability in the Fraser River Basin and across BC. The FBC’s services focus on three main program areas:
1. Healthy watershed and water resources;
2. Climate change and air quality; and
3. Resilient communities and regions

The FVRD paid $51,406 to be a member of the FBC in 2014 and for the FBC to deliver certain projects in the program areas mentioned above. Of this amount, the District contributed $6,426. In 2014, these funds were used to complete work on projects such as the Strategy, air quality education work, Cultus Lake watershed health, and maximizing the FVRD’s presence at the FBC’s Board of Directors meetings. Most of the FBC’s work in any given year is not specific to Mission but, on occasion such as with the Silverdale Creek Wetland outdoor classroom project, funds are spent to support work in Mission. All of the work done by the FBC throughout the Fraser River watershed will benefit Mission to some degree. Of the FVRD’s 2014 contribution of $51,406, $15,000 ($1,875 from Mission’s $6,426) was allocated to fund the Strategy. In 2014, the FBC requested an additional $15,000 from the FVRD’s member municipalities towards the Strategy. Mission chose not to contribute any additional funds at that time, however the District contributed $2,000 in 2015 in support of Phase 1 of the Strategy.

At the heart of the FBC’s mandate is the desire to collaborate with stakeholders and facilitate solutions that promote sustainability throughout the Fraser River basin. The FBC has been a leading agency over the last 18 years for facilitating studies that have provided critical information for improved flood protection in the lower reaches of the Fraser River. An example would be the 2006 review of the Fraser River hydraulic model that determined the flood of record would be about one metre higher than previously thought in the Mission area.

Starting in 2007, the federal Building Canada Plan allocated funds to the province’s Emergency Management BC to administer their Flood Protection Program. The program, designed to support flood protection infrastructure works, ends in 2016 and, while the District was successful in obtaining funds in the past, the most recent application in 2013 was declined.

There are still significant portions of Mission’s diking system that fall well below the Flood Protection elevation, namely the Mission Dike from the Harbour Authority building on Harbour Avenue, upstream to the West Coast Express staging area. The District does not have any rights-of-way in this area for a dike and will need to construct the dike in partnership with a developer when the area is redeveloped, or purchase the land outright. The Silverdale Dike is a non-standard agricultural dike that would require several million dollars in land acquisition and construction to bring the dike to the required standard. The limited amount of assets protected by this dike may not warrant such an investment.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

The District has benefitted from the flood management work completed by the FBC over the years. The Strategy is now entering Phase 2, which will be carried out over the next 2 to 2½ years, and will include the following general objectives:

1. Develop flood analysis tools to better understand the extent of flooding and identify priorities;
2. Increase communications about flood issues and solutions; and
3. Recommend models for governance, collaboration, decision-making, and funding.

With Phase 1 now complete, FBC is looking to secure funds for Phase 2. The proposed budget of $2.5 million would be funded through various agencies, with the most significant contribution from Emergency Management BC in the amount of $1 million. It is proposed that Local governments contribute $300,000 to Phase 2 of the Strategy, of which Mission has been asked to contribute $4,000.

The region-wide development of a flood management Action Agenda will help to argue the case for additional funds from senior level governments. However, it is unclear how the Strategy will leverage...
senior government’s investment from region to region across Canada. It is also expected that future flood protection funding applications will continue to be assessed on site specific needs and consequences. In terms of the value of the region-wide assessment, the District is well aware of the shortcomings in its flood protection system, but a review of bylaws and floodplain management would be useful for the District.

Notwithstanding the lack of direct benefits to Mission that will flow from the Strategy, if the Strategy is instrumental in securing long-term flood protection funding from senior governments, there is an argument for Mission to contribute funds to the Strategy to ensure Mission remains a partner in flood protection in the lower Fraser Valley. Completion of the Strategy will further highlight the importance of sound flood protection management in the Lower Mainland and the need for investment in mitigation measures to reduce the potential impact of severe natural disasters.

Recently, the FBC informed staff that the following work has been completed over the last 18 months on the Strategy:

- **Analysis of Future Flood Scenarios**: This project selected two river flood scenarios and two coastal flood scenarios for use in the Vulnerability Assessment. The research highlighted that under climate change major floods in the Lower Mainland are expected to increase in magnitude and frequency.

- **Regional Assessment of Flood Vulnerabilities**: The key finding of this project was that flood risks in the lower mainland are very serious, and that any one of the flood scenarios analyzed would be expected to trigger the most costly natural disaster in Canadian history.

- **Lower Mainland Dike Assessment**: The assessment of dikes in the Lower Mainland resulted in the majority of dikes being scored as ‘Poor to Fair’. The report recommended that dike upgrades be prioritized, or alternative management strategies be considered if upgrades are not feasible.

- **Review of Flood Management Policies and Practices**: This review found a number of challenges for local governments, including:
  - lack of funding for required upgrades;
  - a lack of consistency in policies throughout the region;
  - issues with historic settlements; and
  - changes in flood hazards related to climate change.

**COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:**
Development of the FBC’s Strategy supports Council’s Objective for providing Optimized Planning and Management of Assets and Infrastructure, by determining deficiencies in design parameters and infrastructure, and identifying solutions and funding options for improvements.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**
The Strategy has the support of 27 local governments, three Provincial Ministries, the Federal Government, and various other stakeholders.

Should Council wish to continue with participation in the Strategy, the requested $4,000 could be sourced from the two Dyke Maintenance accounts, which currently have uncommitted remaining budgets of approximately $6,000 and $4,000.

The current priorities for improving Mission’s diking system are relatively well known. The Lane Creek and Chester Creek pump stations need raising and possible upgrading in capacity, pending a hydraulic review. Land acquisition to secure proper rights of ways is needed in some areas, and preliminary dike designs can be completed to support future funding applications. Any of these projects would need
several tens of thousands of dollars just to prepare detailed designs to submit for funding when it becomes available. Construction costs would be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars range. The pump station projects are included in the Drainage Utility capital plan for years 2020 and 2021, but the budgets are likely inadequate and will require design funding before better estimates can be made. These projects will be considered further during the upcoming drainage master planning process.

Allocating an additional $4,000 towards the Strategy would not materially affect the ability of the District to pay for new flood protection infrastructure projects given the large amount of funding needed to complete new projects.

I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:
Should Council decide to contribute towards the Strategy, staff will apprise the FBC.

SIGN-OFFS:

Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer: Reviewed
October 24, 2016

Attn: Ron Poole
CAO
District of Mission
8645 Stave Lake Street,
Box 20
Mission BC V2V 4L9

RE: Financial Support for Phase 2 – Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy

Dear Ron Poole,

I am writing to thank the District of Mission for previously supporting Phase 1 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy (LMFMS) and to confirm renewed financial support and participation to complete Phase 2. Phase 2 focuses on developing an Action Agenda with priorities, recommended flood mitigation options, and a recommended funding and decision-making model to implement the Action Agenda.

The Fraser Basin Council (FBC) serves as the facilitator and coordinator of the development of the LMFMS. As a non-government organization with four orders of government, the private sector and civil society represented on the FBC Board of Directors, we are well positioned to serve as the impartial body to facilitate dialogue and consensus through this initiative. Decision-making for implementation remains with existing jurisdictions.

FBC has undertaken significant work over the past 18 years to strengthen an integrated approach to flood hazard management in BC with a focus in the Lower Mainland. This work has been advanced primarily through the Joint Program Committee for Flood Hazard Management (JPC). The JPC was established in 1998 and now includes more than fifty agencies and organizations with flood management roles and responsibilities.

Since 2014, the FBC has coordinated Phase 1 of the LMFMS to strengthen flood mitigation in British Columbia’s Lower Mainland to protect communities, critical infrastructure and the economy. Forty-three public and private sector partners generously provided financial support for Phase 1, which is now complete.

In collaboration with, and on behalf of, all partners and the wider Lower Mainland region, FBC is now finalizing plans and securing the necessary funds to complete Phase 2 – the development of an Action Agenda with priorities, recommended flood mitigation options, and a recommended funding and decision-making model for implementation. As you can

Appendix A
appreciate from the attached work plan for Phase 2, we expect a considerable amount of work to be done over the next 2-21/2 years to develop and ‘flesh out’ the Action Agenda as well as reach ‘regional’ consensus on the extent and nature of the Action Agenda. As such, it is understood that this work will require financial contributions from all potentially affected interests in the Lower Mainland to protect the dozens of communities, millions of residents and billions of dollars of infrastructure that could be impacted from river and coastal flooding.

Thus, we are now ready to continue and enhance the collaborative, cost-shared approach that proved to be so successful in Phase 1 to now complete Phase 2. We also look forward to broadening the partnership as we engage with additional funding partners. On behalf of all of the LMFMS partners and the communities and sectors you represent, the Fraser Basin Council respectfully requests a contribution of $4,000 from the District of Mission to support completion of Phase 2 over the next two years. We have attached an invoice for year one of your contribution, however, if you would prefer to make the full contribution in year one, please contact us and we will send you a revised invoice.

Additional information is attached for your reference including the Phase 1 Summary Report, which includes an overview of key steps for the Phase 2 Action Agenda, as well as a summary of proposed actions, deliverables and cost-sharing in Phase 2.

Your continued support and collaboration will help solidify and leverage the participation of other key funding partners in the LMFMS. This is vital to complete a comprehensive regional action plan and to recommend a dedicated funding program for effective flood mitigation measures that serve our shared national, provincial, regional and local interests.

If you have any questions or would like further details about the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy, please contact Steve Litke, Senior Program Manager (604-488-5358). See also www.floodstrategy.ca.

Yours truly,

David Marshall
Executive Director
Fraser Basin Council

Cc: Tracy Kyle
MAPS
See two companion maps to this summary report that show the extent of flood under coastal and Fraser River flood scenarios.

Coastal Map
- Scenario A | Present Day
- Scenario B | Year 2100

Fraser River Map
- Scenario C | Present Day
- Scenario D | Year 2100
Introduction to the Strategy

The LOWER MAINLAND FLOOD MANAGEMENT STRATEGY (LMFMS) is aimed at better protecting communities along the lower Fraser River and coast — from Hope to Richmond and from Squamish to White Rock — from the risk of a major flood. There are 43 partners in the flood strategy: the Government of Canada, Province of BC (three ministries), 27 local governments and 12 public and private sector organizations.

PHASE 1 OF THE STRATEGY (2014-2016) has focused on building a better understanding of flood hazards, flood vulnerabilities and the state of flood protection infrastructure, policies and practices across the region.

PHASE 2 OF THE STRATEGY (2016-2018) is expected to develop a regional strategy and action plan, including recommendations for a secure, sustainable funding model.

The Fraser Basin Council, which manages the project, thanks all the partner agencies and organizations for their financial and in-kind support, and all members of project advisory committees who have devoted time to guiding the work.

This report describes the status of Phase 1 projects and highlights of the work to date.
It's time to plan for larger, more frequent floods.

The BC Lower Mainland is vulnerable to major, catastrophic floods from the Fraser River freshet (spring) and from coastal flooding (winter). In 2014 the Province of BC published a study that described the modelled results of 140 different Fraser River flood scenarios for the Lower Mainland over the next 200 years, reflecting different variables for climate, peak river flows and sea level rise.

In 2015 technical consultants for the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy (Kerr Wood Leidal) analyzed information from this report and other provincial and municipal flood hazard studies, reports and models relevant to the region. Four flood scenarios and related floodwater levels were selected for comparative purposes and as the basis for the regional flood vulnerability assessment (Project 2). These scenarios are:

**Two Coastal Flood Scenarios**
(Present Day and Year 2100): See Table 1 on page 8

**Two Fraser River Spring Freshet Flood Scenarios**
(Present Day and Year 2100): See Table 2 on page 8

The research makes one thing clear: under climate change, major floods in the Lower Mainland are expected to increase in magnitude and frequency. This is so because of projections for sea level rise and for larger peak flows on the Fraser River. Flood mitigation planning for the Lower Mainland must account for the changing face of flood hazards.

A major Lower Mainland flood would be Canada's most costly natural disaster.


The assessment sets out projections for damages and losses related to buildings in Lower Mainland floodplain areas – and the related direct and indirect economic losses – under different flood scenarios.

Four major Lower Mainland flood scenarios were assessed for comparative purposes — two coastal flood scenarios (Present Day and 2100) and two Fraser River flood scenarios (Present Day and 2100). For more about the flood scenarios, see Project 1 on page 6.

The key takeaway is that any one of the four major Lower Mainland flood scenarios analyzed would be expected to trigger the most costly natural disaster in Canadian history to date, creating severe strain on the regional, provincial and national economies.

Flood risks in the Lower Mainland are very serious and are projected to worsen over the next 85 years, both in terms of flood frequency and severity, based on sea level rise and other projected impacts of climate change.

The two present day flood scenarios are expected to result in losses estimated at $19.3 billion (coastal flood) and $22.9 billion (Fraser River flood). Year 2100 flood scenarios are estimated to be higher, totalling $24.7 billion (coastal flood) and $32.7 billion (Fraser River flood). Each would be three to five times more costly than the Alberta floods of 2013.

The study estimated flood-related direct losses and some indirect economic losses related to residential, commercial and public/institutional buildings, some infrastructure, cargo shipping delays and agriculture. Estimates are based on current population levels and development in Lower Mainland floodplain areas. If growth continues, the Year 2100 losses are likely underestimated. The project shows that the Lower Mainland is exposed to a high degree of flood risk. It demonstrates the urgent need for a comprehensive flood management strategy, and commitments for action.
Flood infrastructure in the Lower Mainland needs upgrading & policies and practices need updating.

In 2015 the Inspector of Dikes oversaw an assessment of Lower Mainland dikes as part of Phase 1 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy.

The assessment, carried out by Northwest Hydraulic Consultants, shows that 71% of the assessed dikes are vulnerable to failure by overtopping during either a major Fraser River or coastal flood. Only 4% of assessed dike segments meet current provincial standards for dike crest height, which includes 0.6 m of freeboard above the water surface elevation of the design flood event.

The design flood in the Lower Mainland is the greater of either the 1894 Fraser River flood of record (peak flow of 17,000 cubic metres per second at Hope) or a winter coastal storm surge flood event of approximately 1:200 annual exceedance probability.

In all, 74 dikes were assessed based on current records, and these were divided into 118 segments for the purpose of the project. These dikes — stretching 500 km and managed by 35 diking authorities — represent about 50% of all dikes in BC.

Dikes can fail for different reasons. The assessment covered, not only dike crest height, but also geometry, geotechnical stability during floods and earthquakes, erosion protection, control of vegetation/animal encroachments, appurtenant structures on the dikes and administrative arrangements, including secured rights of way and inspection practices.

A key reason that Lower Mainland dikes are considered vulnerable to failure is because most were reconstructed in the 1970s and 1980s according to the standard of the day, which has since been recognized as too low. The standard has been updated through more accurate flood modelling.

Based on average rankings across multiple criteria, the majority of assessed dikes in the Lower Mainland (69%) were scored as Poor to Fair, 18% as Unacceptable to Poor, and 13% as Fair to Good. Few of the dike segments assessed meet current provincial standards, and no dikes fully meet provincial standards.

Among the report recommendations are to prioritize dike upgrades, and where it is not feasible to upgrade dikes sufficiently, to consider a range of structural and non-structural flood management strategies.

The final report for Project 3B will be completed in late June 2016. Here are the highlights to date.

A diversity of flood protection works, land use policies and management practices are in place throughout the Lower Mainland.

Many communities rely on flood protection dikes and associated works such as pumps, floodgates and erosion protection works, but often lack dedicated funding for major upgrades and rehabilitation. Moreover, some communities, including First Nations, are not presently protected by diking systems at all.

In a 2015-2016 review of local flood management policies and practices, most communities identified flood protection works as a top priority. Some also identified riverbed sediment management as an important tool in the suite of management options to alleviate flooding, erosion and seepage problems.

Most communities use land use planning and policies to limit community vulnerability to flooding. The two primary approaches are flood construction levels and horizontal setbacks. These are typically implemented through bylaws, development permit areas and other policies and practices related to zoning, subdivision approvals and building permits. Growth can be guided away from flood-prone areas, and habitable living space can be built above predicted flood levels with floodproofing practices.

Challenges for local governments include: a lack of funding for major repairs and upgrades to flood protection works, lack of a consistent policy framework to guide communities across the Lower Mainland, challenges associated with historic settlements, and challenges associated with changing flood hazards over time, particularly due to sea level rise and other climate change impacts.

Some of the priorities and suggestions raised by local governments include: a dedicated, multi-year funding program to support rehabilitation of flood protection works; more integrated and comprehensive approaches to flood management planning; reconciling the need for regional consistency with flexibility to accommodate unique local circumstances; improving regulatory and permitting processes; improving knowledge to better inform flood hazard management decisions; developing a long-term plan to manage sediment; and evaluating management options in relation to a diversity of economic, social, environmental and technical criteria.
Building the Lower Mainland Flood Scenarios

In 2014 the Province of BC (Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations) published the results of a modelling study called Simulating the Effects of Sea Level Rise and Climate Change on Fraser River Flood Scenarios. That report sets out 140 possible Fraser River scenarios, including projected floodwater levels, for the 170 km stretch from Hope to the river’s mouth over the next 50, 100 and 200 years. The scenarios were developed using the Fraser River hydraulic model and different variables for climate, peak flows and sea level.

The Fraser Basin Council subsequently retained engineering consultants Kerr Wood Leidal (KWL) to analyze this study and other flood hazard studies, reports and models available across the region. The aim was to select appropriate flood scenarios as a foundation for a regional vulnerability assessment (Project 2: See page 10).

The Bottom Line: Prepare for Larger and More Frequent Floods

The research makes one thing clear: under climate change, major floods in the Lower Mainland are expected to increase in magnitude and frequency. This is because of projections for sea level rise and for larger peak flows on the Fraser River.

Flood mitigation planning for the Lower Mainland must account for the changing face of flood hazards.

The Future of Fraser River Freshet Flooding

Fraser River spring freshet (snowmelt) presents a risk of catastrophic flood in the Lower Mainland, with greatest risk in communities adjacent to the Fraser River from Chilliwack to Richmond.

Current design standards for Fraser River flood infrastructure, such as dikes, are based on water levels of the Fraser River flood of record (1894). The 1894 flood had a peak flow of 17,000 m³/sec (measured at Hope), just slightly higher than the estimated 1-in-500 year flood.

A 1-in-500 year flood is of a magnitude expected to occur – as a long-term average – once in every 500 years. Flood risk can also be expressed as Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP): the probability that a flood of a particular magnitude will be equalled or exceeded in any given year (1:500 AEP). This represents a 0.2% risk of a flood of that magnitude in any given year.

A Fraser River freshet peak flow of 16,500 m³/sec (at Hope) today would currently be considered a 1-in-500 year flood event; by Year 2100, a flood of that magnitude may be expected to have a return period of just 50 years due to the effects of climate change on flood risk.

A Fraser River peak flow of 19,900 m³/sec would today be considered a 1-in-5000 year flood, but by Year 2100 it might be considered a 1-in-500 year event.

Given that some parts of BC have recently experienced mild winters and dry summers, it may seem surprising to plan for larger peak flows on the Fraser River. Climate change, however, heightens the risk of high temperatures in spring. Higher temperatures lead to more rapid melt of snowpack and, when combined with episodes of heavy rainfall, can result in higher peak flows and increased risk of flood. Rapid melt of a large snowpack, with heavy precipitation, could lead to extreme flooding on the Fraser.
For details, see: *Simulating the Effects of Sea Level Rise and Climate Change on Fraser River Flood Scenarios (2014)*, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants and *Selecting and Using Climate Change Scenarios for British Columbia (2011)*, PCIC.

**The Future of Coastal Flooding**

Coastal flooding typically occurs when storm surges combine with high tides during the winter storm season. This is the dominant flood risk for Lower Mainland communities near the mouth of the Fraser and up the coast.

Under current Province of BC projections, sea level is expected to rise one metre by the Year 2100, and two metres by Year 2200, which increases the risk of coastal flooding.

While most BC coastal flood studies reference a 1-in-200 year flood as the minimum requirement for flood assessments and mitigation planning, KWL recommends that a more conservative requirement be considered for developed areas where coastal flooding could occur more regularly or have higher consequences. Given the extensive development and infrastructure in Lower Mainland communities, and the population base, the consultants recommend basing a regional vulnerability assessment on a 1-in-500 year coastal flood.

**Flood Scenarios for Planning**

KWL recommended two coastal flood scenarios (Present Day (A) and Year 2100 (B)) and two Fraser River freshet flood scenarios (Present Day (C) and Year 2100 (D)) – on which to base the Lower Mainland regional vulnerability assessment. The river flooding scenarios relate to the main stem of the Fraser, not its tributaries. The four scenarios were selected to provide a comparative analysis. The KWL report recognizes that uncertainty remains regarding the potential changes in Fraser River flood. Until those uncertainties are reduced through future work, these results support a preliminary quantitative flood risk analysis.

Year 2100 was chosen as a reasonable time horizon for planning, relevant to the lifespan for new buildings and infrastructure.

**Coastal Flood Scenarios**

Coastal flood scenarios can be developed in different ways. For the regional vulnerability assessment, KWL used a uniform measurement of coastal water surface elevation for all locations. The scenarios used data on water levels recorded at Point Atkinson, a station offering over 50 years of data. Under the KWL analysis, coastal flood scenarios show water levels projected at 3.4 metres (Present Day) and 4.4 metres (Year 2100). The Year 2100 coastal scenario reflects one metre of sea level rise. KWL consultants note that the design of flood protection works typically requires site-specific analysis and reliable long-term wind and water level data, which would help account for the effects of waves. This was not undertaken for the purposes of a region-wide vulnerability assessment.
Table 1: Coastal Flood Scenarios for BC Lower Mainland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Flood Water Level (GD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Scenario (A)</td>
<td>• 1-in-500 year storm surge flood</td>
<td>3.4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Day</td>
<td>• Still water ocean state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes .6 m allowance for uncertainties and site variation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current sea level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes .6 m allowance for uncertainties and site variation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current sea level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Includes 1 m sea level rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fraser River Flood Scenarios

In planning for a major freshet flood, the 1894 Fraser River flood of record and a future 1-in-500 year flood will be used, as shown.

Table 2: Fraser River Freshet Flood Scenarios for BC Lower Mainland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Flood Water Level (GD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Freshet Scenario (C)</td>
<td>• Based on 1894 flood of record</td>
<td>Varies by location in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Day</td>
<td>• High tide conditions</td>
<td>floodplain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current sea level</td>
<td>1.55 m to 39.55 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 17,000 m³/sec peak flow at Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Freshet Scenario (D)</td>
<td>• Based on 1-in-500 year flood</td>
<td>Varies by location in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2100</td>
<td>• High tide conditions</td>
<td>floodplain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 m sea level rise &amp; moderate climate change</td>
<td>2.89 m to 40.39 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 19,900 m³/sec peak flow at Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Geodetic datum

Year 2100 was chosen as a reasonable time horizon for planning, relevant to the lifespan for new buildings and infrastructure.
Flood Reports & Maps Online

Reports
Reports from Phase 1 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy (LMFMS) are now available.

Project 1
Simulating the Effects of Sea Level Rise and Climate Change on Fraser River Flood Scenarios

Analysis of Flood Scenarios

Project 2
Regional Assessment of Flood Vulnerability

Project 3
Lower Mainland Dike Assessment

Regional & Subregional Maps
The report Regional Assessment of Flood Vulnerability includes 10 subregional maps of the Lower Mainland that illustrate lands subject to flood in municipalities, First Nations communities and unincorporated areas under coastal flood scenarios A and B and Fraser River flood scenarios C and D.

The subregional maps include some essential facilities and other key infrastructure vulnerable to flood — including fire halls, police stations, emergency operations centres, hospitals, airports, port facilities, BC Hydro substations and schools.

Visit floodstrategy.ca
Background

In preparing a flood mitigation strategy for the Lower Mainland, it is important first to understand what is at risk in the event of a major flood and the costs associated with these risks.

The Fraser Basin Council retained Northwest Hydraulic Consultants (NHC), assisted by several subcontractors, to carry out a region-wide vulnerability assessment based on the four major flood scenarios set out in Project 1. The NHC analysis sets out quantitative projections on damage to and destruction of buildings and equipment in flood-prone areas, including the associated direct and indirect economic losses.

The project further estimates flood damages related to essential facilities such as fire halls, police stations, ambulance stations, hospitals and schools and certain infrastructure such as BC Hydro substations, railways, roads, airports and municipal facilities. Qualitative disruption scenarios were prepared to supplement the quantitative assessment and to flag associated issues.

This quantitative and qualitative vulnerability assessment is the first of its kind at the regional scale and is intended as a tool for regional and local decision-making.

Hazus-MH 2.1 software (Canadian Flood Module) was used to complete the analysis on economic losses related to residential, commercial, industrial and public/institutional buildings. The US Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) developed the Hazus software, which uses GIS information and a standardized methodology for estimating physical, economic and social impacts of disasters such as earthquakes, floods and hurricanes.

The Canadian Flood Module was developed through a collaboration of FEMA and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) and was released for use in November 2015. The Canadian flood module includes national data from the 2011 Population Census as well as a national building inventory. The LMFMS project is the first regional-scale use of the Canadian Hazus flood module.

Losses from interruptions to rail traffic were estimated based on freight transshipped through Port Metro Vancouver. Indirect losses are more difficult to estimate because of the wide range of variables.

Agricultural losses were separately calculated based on federal and provincial data. Consultants prepared an inventory of flood-prone assets based on various government and private sector data.

See the full NHC report Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy Project 2: Regional Assessment of Flood Vulnerability (vulnerability assessment report) for details. The report is available at floodstrategy.ca.

What are the Impacts of a Major Lower Mainland Flood?

Flood Waters Would Cause Damage, Loss and Widespread Disruption

All communities in the Lower Mainland are vulnerable to the direct or indirect impacts of a major coastal or Fraser River flood. A major Lower Mainland coastal flood would be expected to inundate 54,700 hectares in present day (61,100 ha by 2100) and a Fraser River flood to inundate 99,300 hectares in present day (110,300 ha by 2100).
In addition to land under local government jurisdiction within the Lower Mainland, there are 30 First Nations with a total of 90 reserves and treaty lands in the project area. One-third of the reserves are not subject to inundation; the remaining two-thirds (61 reserves, affecting 26 First Nations) are vulnerable to flooding. For details, see the vulnerability assessment report (Appendix B, Annex C).

Flood presents major economic risks, as well as risks to public health, social well-being and the environment.

Transportation and trade-related impacts would be far-reaching. The Lower Mainland may become grid-locked for personal, commercial and industrial transportation by road, rail and air. Supply lines will consequently be disrupted. “Just-in-time” delivery is common throughout the region, which is very efficient for most purposes, but not designed for rare events such as disasters. As a result, the available food supply and other supplies could be impacted in as little as four days.

Disruption to the flow of goods into and out of Port of Vancouver and the Greater Vancouver area due to a flood would have severe consequences on the regional, provincial and national economy, with significant indirect losses and declines in taxes and other government revenues.

Communications facilities are vulnerable to system overload or damage, including 911 call centres, cell towers, cables, the internet and telephone land lines, which represent risks to people, property and business continuity.

Environmental contamination would be significant in a flood, as a result of chemicals, fertilizers, petroleum products and raw sewage from agricultural, transportation, septic, municipal wastewater, industrial and hazardous waste storage sites and from existing contaminated sites.

A major flood is expected to result in:

- damage to and destruction of residential, commercial, industrial, public/institutional and agricultural buildings, equipment and other property
- damage to or destruction of essential infrastructure
- disruption of private and public services
- displacement of people
- environmental contamination

As in any natural disaster, there is also the sobering potential for serious injury and loss of life.

A Look at Properties Damaged or Destroyed

A major Lower Mainland flood would be expected to damage or destroy many buildings in floodplain areas.

Table 3 on page 13 sets out projections on the number of residential, commercial, industrial and public/institutional buildings that would be damaged or destroyed in Lower Mainland communities under flood scenarios A, B, C and D, together with total building-related costs and debris generated. Note that agricultural building costs are summarized in a separate table.

If a flood were to occur today in the Lower Mainland under scenarios A or C, it would be expected to generate 650,000 US tons (595,000 metric tonnes) of debris. That would more than double by Year 2100 under flood scenarios B or D.

Property damage and losses for all Lower Mainland communities are included in the analysis that follows.
Assumptions in the Flood Assessment

Four basic flood scenarios were central to the assessment: two coastal flood scenarios A and B (Present Day and 2100) and two Fraser River flood scenarios C and D (Present Day and 2100). Certain assumptions are built into the scenarios and the analysis.

Assumption about Dikes & Floodproofing

To simplify the analysis, it was assumed that all Lower Mainland dikes would breach in all flood scenarios, and that flood waters would inundate all low-lying areas for the duration of the flood. This is a simplified, worst-case scenario to identify vulnerability and to assess losses at a regional level.

While it is possible that all dikes could fail, the scenarios do not predict where or how any dikes would fail. It is also possible that some Lower Mainland dikes would fail, while other dikes would not. For example, if during a Fraser River flood some upstream dikes in the Fraser Valley fail, this could have impacts downstream. The upstream floodplain might store a significant amount of water such that downstream dikes may not fail, or it may be that downstream flooding is less extensive or severe than if all dikes failed at once.

The Lower Mainland Dike Assessment (see page 25) evaluated the current status of dikes in relation to several criteria. This project found that the vast majority of dikes have deficiencies ranging from the elevation of the dike, to vulnerability to seismic events and other factors. Therefore it is not unreasonable to assume widespread dike failures for the purposes of the vulnerability assessment and the four flood scenarios.

It is assumed that no buildings or infrastructure have been elevated above predicted floodwaters to reduce or prevent flood damages. This is known as floodproofing. Floodproofing typically involves raising the ground level by adding fill or by placing habitable living space or vulnerable electrical/mechanical equipment above garages, carports, crawl spaces, parkades or other building features that would be less susceptible to flood damages.

Assumption about the Extent of Flood

Coastal Flood: Flood levels were projected horizontally across the land, with an additional 0.6 m allowance for wave action and uncertainties. Future increases in storminess due to climate change were not considered (i.e., more severe coastal storm surge events).

The specific localized effects of waves on different coastal communities were not considered. Fraser River Flood: Flood levels were projected horizontally across the floodplain, perpendicular to the river except in some areas for which there are floodplain maps, in which case the maps were used to project water levels. Flooding from Fraser River tributaries was not included in the assessment.

Assumption about Flood Duration & Recovery

Coastal Flood: Two Weeks. A coastal storm surge flood (scenarios A and B) was assumed to last two weeks, which includes flooding and the subsequent drainage of flood waters.

Fraser River Flood: Four Weeks. The duration of a Fraser River flood (scenarios C and D) was assumed to be four weeks, encompassing both flooding and the drainage of flood waters.

Flood duration is relevant to calculations on transportation disruption, specifically disrupted cargo shipments, and on agricultural losses. Initially, agricultural losses were calculated on short-duration floods (two-day coastal flood, two-week Fraser River flood) and those losses are tallied in Table 7. However, the total agricultural losses were later grossed up 2.25X to reflect the impacts of a two-week coastal flood and four-week Fraser River flood. See page 17 for detail.

Flood duration is not applied to building-related losses, which are calculated in Hazus software. Default recovery times for buildings calculated in the Hazus software is between 1 and 33 months. Note that full recovery times will vary.

Assumption about Future Growth & Development

Due to significant uncertainty about population growth and community development over the long-term, it was assumed that there would be no additional growth in population, number of buildings or infrastructure in Lower Mainland floodplain areas between present day and 2100. However, if growth in these areas continues, damage estimates will be significantly underestimated.
Table 3: Residential, Commercial, Industrial & Public/Institutional Buildings – Damaged & Destroyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Scenario</th>
<th># Buildings Damaged</th>
<th># Buildings Destroyed</th>
<th>Total Building-Related Losses ($)</th>
<th>Debris Generated*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>$14.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>$19.1 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>$9.0 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>$18.4 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Debris is stated in US tons

What will Flood Cost?: The Economic Losses

Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Public/Institutional Buildings

The building-related losses, including some indirect costs, were estimated for residential, commercial, industrial and public/institutional buildings, using the Hazus software and additional analysis. These estimates encompass:

- Building repair and replacement costs
- Building contents
- Building inventory
- Relocation expenses
- Capital-related income losses
- Wage losses
- Rental income losses.

Infrastructure

Estimates were made for damage to infrastructure such as electrical substations, airports, marine facilities, rail lines, critical highways and arterial roads, rapid transit lines, wastewater treatment plants, police and emergency services, hospitals, municipal halls and works yards. Most of these estimates could not be made using the Hazus software; a simplified valuation approach was followed.

Excluded Losses

The estimates do not include other losses that have potential to be significant, such as:

- economic losses associated with disruption of infrastructure or businesses (other than interruption of cargo shipments)
- losses relating to future growth in population density or development in floodplain areas: see “Assumptions” on page 12.
- environmental decontamination
- debris clean-up
**Essential Facilities Impacted**

Table 4 sets out projections on some of the essential facilities expected to suffer damage under flood scenarios A, B, C and D. In addition to those listed in Table 4, critical public facilities vulnerable to flood include four municipal halls, seven works yards, three prisons with over 1,000 inmates and two energy utilities (False Creek and Richmond).

**Table 4: Essential Facilities Damaged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Scenario</th>
<th>Fire Stations</th>
<th>Police Stations</th>
<th>Hospitals</th>
<th>Ambulance Stations</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**People Displaced**

A major flood under any of the four flood scenarios is expected to force many people to move from their homes to take up temporary shelter within or outside the region. These people will be in need of food, supplies and emergency services.

The numbers in Table 5 are based on 2011 Population Census data and the projected extent of flooding associated with each of the flood scenarios. If population growth in floodplain areas continues, the numbers could be expected to be higher by 2100 under scenarios B and D.

**Table 5: People Displaced & Seeking Shelter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Scenario</th>
<th># People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure Impacted

The vulnerability assessment identifies some key Lower Mainland infrastructure that is susceptible to flood and sets out related loss estimates based on rough replacement (valuation) costs developed by the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This infrastructure analysis could not be done within the Hazus software.

Table 6 sets out examples of infrastructure subject to flood damage and the associated loss estimates. It covers:

- electrical substations
- airports
- marine facilities
- rail lines
- critical highway routes and arterial roads
- rapid transit lines
- wastewater treatment plants
- emergency facilities
- hospitals
- municipal halls and work yards
- schools.

These are order-of-magnitude estimates for regional planning purposes, and much more work would be required to refine the results. Note that there may be minor double counting of select facilities (emergency facilities, hospitals and schools) because of differences in the source data and methodologies used; this duplication represents about 2% of the total damages estimated under the Hazus software. For a list of assumptions on infrastructure losses, see the following page.

Table 6: Economic Loss Projections Related to Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>Quantity Affected</th>
<th>Valuation Cost ($)</th>
<th>Corresponding Loss Estimate (Millions $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports – YVR2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports – Local3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major marine facilities4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor marine facilities5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail lines6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical highway routes7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid transit lines8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater plants9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/emergency services10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal halls / works yards, etc.12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikes (pumpstations not included)14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($ Million)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded Total ($ Billion)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 Assumptions

1. Assume all substations are of medium size and repair costs amount to 50% of FEMA valuation cost.
2. 50% of FEMA valuation cost for key components (1 of each).
3. Repair and clean-up.
4. 50% of FEMA valuation cost for key components (1 of each).
5. 10% of FEMA valuation cost for key components (1 of each).
6. Assume 5km must be rebuilt at each inundated section at 50% of FEMA valuation cost.
7. Assume 5km must be rebuilt at each inundated section at 50% of FEMA valuation cost.
8. Assume 5km must be rebuilt at each inundated section at 50% of FEMA valuation cost.
9. Assume all plants are of medium size and repair costs amount to 10% of FEMA valuation cost.
10. Repair and clean-up $2,600/m² * 1,000 m² (ref. Marshall & Swift).
11. Repair and clean-up $4,100/m² * 1,000 m² (ref. Marshall & Swift).
12. Repair and clean-up $2,500/m² * 1,000 m² (ref. Marshall & Swift).
13. Repair and clean-up $2,400/m² * 1,000 m² (ref. Marshall & Swift).
14. Replacement/upgrade of 200m long breached sections, assumed cost of $5,000/m.
15. Mission Rail, Patullo, CN Rail.

For consideration of some of the service disruptions expected with flooded infrastructure, see “Vulnerability of Key Infrastructure and Potential for Service Disruptions” on page 20.

In a coastal flood, infrastructure losses are estimated at $1.4 billion (Present Day) and $1.8 billion (Year 2100). In a Fraser River flood, infrastructure losses are estimated at $4.7 billion (Present Day) and $5 billion (Year 2100) as set out in Table 6.
Table 7: Agricultural Losses under Flood Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Scenario</th>
<th>Flood Vulnerable Area (Hectares)</th>
<th>Lost Farm Gate Sales (Millions)</th>
<th>Damage to Equipment (Millions)</th>
<th>Damage to Buildings (Millions)</th>
<th>Replanting Loss (Millions)</th>
<th>Total: Short-Duration Flood*</th>
<th>Total: Long-Duration Flood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
<td>14,626</td>
<td>$16.5 M</td>
<td>$12.7 M</td>
<td>$37.9 M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$67.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
<td>15,214</td>
<td>$17.4 M</td>
<td>$14.6 M</td>
<td>$40.9 M</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$72.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
<td>43,459</td>
<td>$410.1 M</td>
<td>$50.7 M</td>
<td>$223 M</td>
<td>$9.5 M</td>
<td>$693.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
<td>43,813</td>
<td>$423 M</td>
<td>$50.7 M</td>
<td>$227.3 M</td>
<td>$9.5 M</td>
<td>$700.6 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The estimates by category in this table are based on floods of short duration (two-day coastal flood and two-week Fraser River flood). As noted, agricultural losses would increase under a longer duration flood (two-week coastal flood and four-week Fraser River flood).

### Agriculture-Related Losses

Agricultural loss calculations include damage to agricultural buildings (but not farm houses, which were included in the Hazus residential building analysis), damage to equipment and lost farm gate sales, based on federal and provincial data.

Projected losses are higher under Fraser River scenarios because river flooding would occur over a longer period and during the spring/summer when crops are in the ground.

Floods of more than two-weeks duration are expected to have considerably higher associated costs. Consultants estimated losses would increase by a factor of 2.25. The totals for short- and long-duration floods are set out below. The longer flood duration loss estimates were used in the summary of total economic losses in Table 8 on page 18.

#### Agricultural Losses under Coastal Flooding (Present Day & Year 2100)

$67-73 million in estimated losses (short-duration flood)
- 14,000-15,000 hectares of farmland flooded
- $17 million in lost farm gate sales
- $13-15 million in equipment damage
- $38-41 million in building damage

$100-200 million in estimated losses (long-duration flood)

#### Agricultural Losses under Fraser River Flooding (Present Day and 20100)

$693-700 million in estimated losses (short-duration flood)
- 43-44,000 hectares of farmland flooded
- $410-423 million in lost farm gate sales
- $10 million in replanting costs
- $51 million in equipment damage
- $223-227 million in building damage (excluding farm homes)

$1.6 billion in estimated losses (long-duration flood)
Table 8: Total Economic Loss Projections under Flood Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Scenario</th>
<th>Residential¹</th>
<th>Commercial¹</th>
<th>Industrial¹</th>
<th>Public/Institutional Buildings¹</th>
<th>Interrupted Cargo Shipments²</th>
<th>Infrastructure³</th>
<th>Agriculture⁴</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
<td>$5.6 B</td>
<td>$6.3 B</td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
<td>$720 M</td>
<td>$3.6 B</td>
<td>$1.4 B</td>
<td>$100 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
<td>$7.1 B</td>
<td>$8.6 B</td>
<td>$2.6 B</td>
<td>$910 M</td>
<td>$3.6 B</td>
<td>$1.8 B</td>
<td>$200 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
<td>$2.6 B</td>
<td>$3.8 B</td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
<td>$880 M</td>
<td>$7.7 B</td>
<td>$4.6 B</td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
<td>$6.6 B</td>
<td>$7.6 B</td>
<td>$2.9 B</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$7.7 B</td>
<td>$5.0 B</td>
<td>$1.6 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 summarizes economic loss projections for all types of loss included in this vulnerability assessment, across the entire region, based on longer duration flood: a two-week coastal flood (Scenarios A and B) or four-week Fraser River Flood (Scenarios C and D).

Notes

1 Building-related loss projections encompass the cost of repair or replacement of residential, commercial, industrial and public/institutional buildings damaged or destroyed by flood, and include losses relating to inventory, relocation and wages.
2 These are revenues from delays and cancellations in cargo shipping.
3 Included in infrastructure are electrical substations.
4 These losses include agricultural buildings and equipment damaged or destroyed, lost farm gate sales and replanting costs.

Notes & Limitations on Hazus Analysis

The Hazus software used in Project 2 to calculate building-related losses has limitations, and output generally needs to be supplemented with additional assessment.

Some limitations are:

- The module offers helpful regional-scale estimates, although there are limitations because of data gaps that could not be addressed within the project budget. Not all data sources had up-to-date data.
- Building repair and replacement costs reflect those costs in the United States; such costs are expected to be higher in the Lower Mainland. Hazus calculations were multiplied by 1.6 to account for the difference.
- Currency conversion ($US to $CDN) was set at 10%. This is acknowledged to be low, as the conversion rate was 32% as of March 2016.
- The Canadian version of Hazus lacks a module for calculating indirect losses.
- For full details on limitations, see the Lower Mainland Flood Vulnerability Assessment report.
Summary of Losses under Coastal and Fraser River Flood Scenarios

Coastal Flood Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenrio</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Building Losses</th>
<th>Cargo Shipments</th>
<th>Infrastructure Losses</th>
<th>Agricultural Losses</th>
<th>Total Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Coastal (Present Day)</td>
<td>two weeks</td>
<td>$14.2 billion</td>
<td>$3.6 billion</td>
<td>$1.4 billion</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal (Year 2100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 2100 coastal flood damages are projected at $19.1 billion for building-related losses, $3.6 billion for interrupted cargo shipments, $1.8 billion for infrastructure losses and $200 million for agricultural losses. This amounts to $24.7 billion.

Fraser River Flood Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenrio</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Building Losses</th>
<th>Cargo Shipments</th>
<th>Infrastructure Losses</th>
<th>Agricultural Losses</th>
<th>Total Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>River (Present Day)</td>
<td>four weeks</td>
<td>$9 billion</td>
<td>$3.6 billion</td>
<td>$1.8 billion</td>
<td>$1.6 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>River (Year 2100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the year 2100, a major flood is expected to be more significant, resulting in greater building-related losses, primarily as a result of deeper flood waters. The estimate is $18.4 billion in building-related losses, $7.7 billion in cargo shipment interruptions, $5 billion in infrastructure losses and $1.6 billion in agricultural losses. This amounts to $32.7 billion.

The consequences of infrastructure damage and disruption, including cascading effects, is difficult to project and would likely drive costs higher than the above projections. See the full report for limitations on the analysis.
Vulnerability of Key Infrastructure and Potential for Service Disruptions

Here is a look at some of the key infrastructure in Lower Mainland flood-prone areas and the potential for service disruptions under the flood scenarios A, B, C & D.

For details of infrastructure and the potential for disruption by subregion and by community under all four flood scenarios, see Appendix B to the vulnerability assessment report: Identification of Infrastructure & Asset Vulnerability.

Electrical Substations

- BC Hydro substations in nine of the 10 sub-regions will be exposed to some flood risk.
- 19-37 substations will be exposed in coastal flood scenarios A and B and 23-30 in Fraser River flood scenarios C and D.
- The Richmond-Delta sub-region has the most vulnerable substations followed by Vancouver-Burnaby-New Westminster; together these areas account for 67-83% of vulnerable substations.
- Electrical equipment is elevated (transformer cabinets up to 1.5 m above grade).
- There is some degree of redundancy in the system to allow some substations to go off-line if needed.
- Flood damaged equipment would require repair or replacement, which could only occur after flood waters recede, for safety reasons.
- A station damaged or disrupted by flood waters could affect other areas that may be outside of the floodplain.
- Loss of electricity would seriously impact the daily lives of residents, in particular the elderly and other vulnerable populations.
- Affected businesses and industries, which could include those outside of floodplain areas, may not be able to operate, incurring loss of revenue.
- Hospitals have generators, but if fuel supply is affected, electricity could be interrupted.

Electrical Generation & Transmission Grid

- Less than 10% of Hydro’s electrical generation is within the Lower Mainland, and none of those facilities are in floodplain areas.
- All but one of the 10 sub-regions have transmission lines in areas vulnerable to flooding under one or more of the scenarios.
- All transmission lines are elevated.
- There is vulnerability if the foundations of transmission towers are undermined through erosion, or if powerlines or other infrastructure are damaged or downed by felled trees and other hazards.
- Damaged or downed low-voltage power lines could result in local loss of power and potential risk of electrocution, particularly if cables are in populated areas.
- If high-voltage lines are downed, this could disrupt power to multiple substations and have wide-ranging impacts.
**Airports**

- Vancouver International Airport (YVR) is Canada’s second busiest airport. It is vulnerable to flood under all flood scenarios, as are smaller airports in the region: Boundary Bay Airport, Pitt Meadows Airport and Delta Heritage Air Park.
- Flood would impact all YVR runways, taxiways to terminals, grounds of the main and south terminals, all access roads to the terminals and the SkyTrain Canada line.
- YVR would be non-functional for the duration of a flood, resulting in cancellations and/or re-routing of passengers and cargo flights.
- Major retrofits are needed, some are underway, to address future flood levels.
- Abbotsford International Airport (YXX) is not in floodplain and may be able to accommodate diverted demand to a limited extent; however, Highways 1 and 11 are subject to flood so access routes are an issue. The Abbotsford airport may be a key facility for emergency supplies.
- Other airports in the region (Boundary Bay Airport and small regional airports) are unlikely to accommodate more traffic due to size and the fact they too are vulnerable to flood under one or more scenarios.
- Other possible areas for diversion: Victoria, Kelowna and airports in Washington State.

**Ports & Ferries**

- Port of Vancouver (previously Port Metro Vancouver) is Canada’s busiest port and North America’s largest port by total tonnage – operating 28 marine cargo terminals, three cruise ship terminals, three Class 1 railroads (CN, CP and BNSF) and a regional short line railroad.
- There are various Port of Vancouver facilities subject to flooding in seven of the 10 sub-regions, under all flood scenarios.
- Port equipment may be vulnerable, such as electrical motors for cranes (a lesson learned from Hurricane Sandy in the US). Elevated cargo containers and bulk products at the port may be less sensitive to flood.
- Access routes to port facilities – both road and rail – are critical, and these would be disrupted and potentially damaged due to flood.
- There is possible risk to fuel transport or fuel storage facilities, which is also a potential source of environmental contamination.
- Port disruptions would have serious economic consequences for business that relies on imports and exports. The 2014 trucker strike disruption, for example, was estimated to cost $126 million a day.
- Some shipments could be diverted to functional facilities, but at increased cost.
- Access to the BC Ferries Tsawwassen terminal would be severed during a coastal flood and the Horseshoe Bay ferry terminal may be subject to flooding. The TransLink Seabus terminals in Vancouver and North Vancouver are at risk of flood under scenarios A and B, and the Barnston Island ferry crossing is vulnerable under all flood scenarios.
Railways

- All three Class 1 railways in the Lower Mainland (CN, CP and BNSF) are vulnerable to some flooding under all scenarios, which could prevent rail freight entering or leaving the region, with cascading events for supply chains.
- Rail passenger service is also vulnerable under all scenarios, including the West Coast Express commuter trains.
- For example, under a Fraser River flood today (scenario C), Highway 7 and the CP Rail mainline in Mission could both be flooded, affecting all rail/road transportation on the North Side of the Fraser River.

Critical Regional Routes

- Highways 1, 7 and 11, north and south of the Fraser, are subject to flooding in multiple sections.
- Highway 99, linking the Vancouver area to Squamish and south to the US border, is also vulnerable, under some scenarios.
- Other critical routes subject to flood include Knight Street, Marine Way, Boundary Road, Highway 91A, Brunette Ave, Stewardson Way/Front Street, King George Boulevard, Highway 7B and South Fraser Perimeter Road, along with municipal arterial roads.
- Disruption to road networks could disrupt emergency services to vulnerable people, isolate portions of the workforce and disrupt intra-regional trade.

Rapid Transit

- Public transit across the region will be impacted by flood through disruptions to SkyTrain, West Coast Express and roads used by transit buses, though some buses may be rerouted.
- The SkyTrain Expo, Millennium and Canada lines will be subject to flooding in parts of Vancouver (including Waterfront Station) and the Canada line is vulnerable to flood in Richmond and Sea Island where it is at grade.
- In addition, many of the electrical controls for elevated sections of SkyTrain are at grade.
- Loss of service in one part of the SkyTrain system will impact overall passenger capacity due to switching and other issues.
- A disruption in transit service will prevent many people from travelling for work, school, health care and recreation.
Water Supply and Waste Treatment

- Drinking water supply for much of the region is not expected to be impacted by flood. Metro Vancouver’s water supply is primarily from mountain reservoirs and storage facilities that are outside of floodplain. Water distribution is in floodplain areas but at pressure and less sensitive to disruption. There is potential for scouring of water lines where they cross the Fraser River.
- Public and private wells located within floodplain areas may be vulnerable to contamination if flood waters include contaminants and enter well heads.
- Wastewater treatment facilities are of concern since 10 across the region are vulnerable to flood: five operated by Metro Vancouver and five operated by local governments in the Fraser Valley.
- The Squamish wastewater treatment plant is not subject to coastal flooding, but is vulnerable to local river flood. The Britannia Beach wastewater treatment facility is also vulnerable to coastal flood.
- Floodwater and debris may damage wastewater treatment facilities.
- Pipes may back up and flood the facilities; systems may remain waterlogged and incapacitated long after flood waters have receded.
- Plants also need power, so a loss of power could also result in sewage backups.
- Failure of one or more plants could mean raw sewage flows into the Fraser River or directly to the Strait of George, with associated environmental contamination.

Emergency Services

- Most emergency operations centres for local governments are located within municipal halls, police stations or fire halls. Most are not subject to flood, but four do have some vulnerability under one or more flood scenarios.
- A significant number of emergency service facilities (fire, police and ambulance) are vulnerable to flood in Region 5 (Richmond/Delta) and 10 (Chilliwack/Abbotsford).
- These facilities are important for emergency response and recovery and for protecting public health and safety.
Health Care Providers

- Hospitals in Regions 5 (Delta/Richmond) and 10 (Chilliwack) and a psychiatric hospital in Region 7 (Coquitlam) are subject to flood in two or more scenarios. Existing operations and patients would need to be transferred to other facilities.
- Facilities can be impacted by flood via structural damage, loss of power beyond auxiliary power, loss of road access, loss of essential personnel, loss of supplies, including food and medicine, and contamination of facilities from flood waters.
- Some sensitivity can be reduced by ensuring critical equipment on site is above the predicted flood levels.
- The proposed relocation site for St. Paul’s Hospital would be subject to flooding under coastal scenario B. The site can be flood-proofed to elevate facilities, but access roads would be flooded.

Schools

- A large number of schools are subject to flooding under all flood scenarios: 80 (Coastal scenario A), 95 (Coastal scenario B), 116 (Fraser River scenario C) and 120 (Fraser River scenario D).
- A majority are public elementary schools; the remaining are public secondary or private schools.
- A majority of all schools vulnerable to flood are in Region 5 (Richmond/Delta) and Region 10 (primarily Chilliwack, but also Abbotsford). Under scenarios C and D, 88% of all flooded schools are in these regions.

Other Infrastructure Services

- Other infrastructure subject to flood (under one or more scenarios) include four municipal halls (Delta, Richmond, Chilliwack and Squamish), seven municipal works yards, three prisons with over 1,000 inmates and two energy facilities in False Creek and Richmond.
- Other infrastructure merits further research, including community centres, public assembly buildings, assisted living facilities, seniors’ homes, daycare centres and supermarkets.
Project 3 | Assessment of Flood Infrastructure, Policies & Practices

Project 3A Status: Lower Mainland Dike Assessment (Complete)
Project 3B Status: Review of Flood Management Policies & Procedures (75% complete)

Project 3A: Lower Mainland Dike Assessment

Project 3A is focused on the effectiveness of flood protection in the Lower Mainland under current and future flood scenarios based on assessment of:

- Flood protection infrastructure (a Lower Mainland dike assessment) and
- Flood management policies and practices.

Background

The BC Lower Mainland has over 500 kilometres of dikes to protect communities against Fraser River and coastal floods. These dikes have been built over decades, to variable standards.

In 2015 the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations retained Northwest Hydraulic Consultants Ltd., with assistance from Thurber Engineering Ltd. (Vancouver), to carry out an overview assessment of Lower Mainland dikes. The project was carried out under Phase 1 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy, with oversight from the Provincial Inspector of Dikes and with support of an Advisory Committee. An assessment was made of 500 km of Lower Mainland dikes, which is about half the length of all dikes in BC. The assessment was aimed at:

- evaluating the level of protection the dikes provide
- identifying major deficiencies, and
- providing a database for flood management authorities to use, update and expand over time.

This was a desktop study that relied on data and other information from the Ministry, from diking authorities and from documents, such as dike crest surveys, inspection reports and engineering assessments. No new field investigations were carried out.

Here is a summary of highlights. For details, see the full report from Northwest Hydraulics Consultants: *Lower Mainland Dike Assessment* (dike assessment report).
Table 9: Dike Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dike Crest Elevation</td>
<td>• Adequacy vis-a-vis flood design level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate freeboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Geometry</td>
<td>• Crest width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landside slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waterside slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Geotechnical Stability – General</td>
<td>• Dike stable for flood conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dike safe to be raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal potential for seepage and landside heave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Geotechnical Stability – Seismic</td>
<td>• Meeting provincial guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Erosion Protection</td>
<td>• Location of dike/setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection from erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vegetation/Animal Control</td>
<td>• Woody vegetation or brush on slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Animal burrows or damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Encroachments</td>
<td>• Buildings/ fences encroaching on right of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roads/railways affecting dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appurtenant Structures</td>
<td>• Operational status of any structures (pump stations, flood boxes, culverts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buried utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administration</td>
<td>• Secured access and rights of way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operations manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergency supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flood response plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the criteria was scored on a four-point scale: “good (=4)”, “fair (=3)”, “poor (=2)”, and “unacceptable (=1)”.

Dike Assessment Criteria

Each dike in the assessment was evaluated on nine criteria, summarized in Table 9.

How Will our Dikes Hold?

Few Lower Mainland dikes meet current provincial standards, and none fully meet or exceed the standards. With scoring averaged across nine criteria on the four-point scale, the majority of dikes (69%) scored as poor to fair (2-3 points), 18% as unacceptable to poor (1-2 points), and 13% as fair to good (3-4 points).
Here are some of the reasons the dikes are deficient:

- Research and flood modelling over the past 10 years has resulted in more accurate design flood levels (that is, higher projected water levels than the dikes were originally designed to withstand)
- Structural and geotechnical design criteria (such as wider dike crests and seismic criteria) have become more stringent over time
- Increasing encroachments of buildings, roads, appurtenant structures and buried utilities on and within dikes can interfere with maintenance and, in some cases, potentially create areas of weakness.

**Dike Crest Height**

The design flood in the Lower Mainland is the greater of either the 1894 Fraser River flood of record (peak flow of 17,000 cubic metres per second at Hope) or a winter coastal storm surge flood event of approximately 1:200 annual exceedance probability.

Fraser River dikes were built to standards developed for the Fraser River flood Control Program in the 1960s and 1970s. Hydraulic modelling between 2006 and 2014 shows that present flood levels would be up to one metre higher in some areas, assuming flood flows are confined by dikes. The Province has accordingly updated standards for the design flood on the Fraser River, which includes a higher dike crest height.

With respect to the crest height of Lower Mainland dikes, only 4% of the 118 dike segments assessed are currently built to a standard sufficient to withstand the design flood (including 0.6 m freeboard). Another 25% of the dikes have 0.3 m of freeboard allowance, and these dikes may or may not withstand the design flood. There are 17% of the dikes with a crest that would match the projected water level of the design flood, and 54% with crests below the projected water level; in both cases, these dikes would be expected to be overtopped.

In general, the Fraser River dikes can withstand only a 1:100 year flood (as measured at Mission) with a few dikes capable of withstanding a 1:200 year flood, but no dikes fully meet the current provincial standard. Some dikes will experience localized overtopping at the 1:20 year flood level.

Lower Mainland sea dikes must have site-specific design criteria based on location and wave exposure. Current design criteria for coastal sea dikes, set in the early 1970s, are now considered too low by most coastal engineering practitioners. The Province has not yet set new standards or required dikes to be raised to address sea level rise. However, sea dike guidelines were published in 2011.
Geotechnical Stability for Flood Conditions

Geotechnical stability for flood conditions could not be assessed on 22% of the dike segments because of insufficient information. The remaining 78% were scored as follows: 10% as “good,” 36% as “fair,” 27% as “poor” and 5% as “unacceptable.”

Table 12: Geotechnical Stability of Lower Mainland Dikes for Flood Conditions
Average score (4-point scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dike Segments Meeting Provincial Standard</th>
<th>Dike Segments Below Provincial Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not expected to be overtopped by major flood</td>
<td>May or may not be overtopped by major flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design flood level + .6 m of freeboard</td>
<td>Design flood level + .3 m of freeboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design flood level + no freeboard</td>
<td>Below design flood level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geotechnical Stability for Earthquake

Seismic ratings were assigned for 71% of the dike segments: 18% almost met seismic guidelines, though none did so over their entire length, and 53% were seismically unstable. No assessment was made on 29% of dike segments because of insufficient information.

Dikes constructed next to sloping ground over Fraser River sediment are of particular concern with respect to seismic stability. The project consultants expect the dikes to be deformed or displaced during a 1-in-2,475 year return period earthquake. Liquefaction of foundation soils is generally the greatest risk for seismically induced displacements. However, the strain softening of fine grain foundation soils can also displace dikes that are overly steep.

Appendix B
The Other Criteria

Dikes can fail for reasons other than insufficient height or geotechnical stability. As noted on page 26, nine different criteria were included in the dike assessment. The scores for each of these criteria related to each of the dike segments are available in the dike assessment report.

Dike Assessment Report

The Lower Mainland Dike Assessment report (July 2015) been made is available to all LMFMS partners. Once posted by the Province, the report will also be linked at floodstrategy.ca.

The report includes a list of dikes included in the assessment, an overview of provincial standards and guidelines, details on assessment criteria, the geotechnical report and a matrix setting out the scores for all assessed dikes in all communities.

With respect to the crest height of Lower Mainland dikes, only 4% of the 118 dike segments assessed are currently built to a standard sufficient to withstand the design flood.
Project 3B | Review of Flood Management Policies and Practices

The Fraser Basin Council, with support from the Adaptation to Climate Change Team (ACT) at Simon Fraser University, is leading Project 3B. The project will be completed by the end of June 2016.

The aim of Project 3B is to summarize and evaluate the effectiveness of current flood protection policies and practices across the Lower Mainland. The project includes analysis of gaps, limitations, challenges and barriers with respect to existing flood management policies and practices, and recommendations on short-, medium- and long-term priorities. The project also explores in a preliminary way the potential transferability of policies and practices across different jurisdictions within the Lower Mainland.

This project evaluates the effectiveness of flood policies and practices in several ways:

- A literature review to help in summarizing the infrastructure, policies and practices used by different local governments
- Interviews with representative local governments to identify a range of current approaches with respect to flood protection infrastructure, policies and practices so as to identify which of those approaches are working well and to flag which need improvement
- A quantitative analysis, piloted in one community, to estimate the value of building permits approved in floodplain areas and to identify what flood construction levels were used.

A History of Settlement and Flood Management in BC

BC is a mountainous region, and early European settlement often occurred in river valleys (i.e., floodplain areas), setting a trend of development that would continue for the centuries that followed. Today, development in the Lower Mainland is generally exposed to some degree of flood hazard, whether it is from coastal flooding, river flooding or flooding from other watercourses.

In August 1966, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board's Official Regional Plan (covering the area from Hope to the Georgia Strait) was approved. The plan included a policy that floodplains were to be kept free of urban uses, save where urban development was already present. Further urban development was to include floodproofing measures. Future development on floodplains was to be limited to uses that would not be highly susceptible to flood damage. The Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board was dissolved in 1969 and its planning functions divided among four regional districts.

Some floodplain areas are classified as part of the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). Despite development pressures throughout the Lower Mainland over the years, the ALR has prevented widespread development in floodplain areas.

The large Fraser River flood of 1972 and resulting damage in the BC Interior (particularly near Kamloops) was a catalyst for new legislation, policies, and procedures at the provincial level. These initiatives were aimed at controlling development in the floodplain and reducing potential damages. From 1975 to 2003, the province managed development in designated floodplain areas under the Floodplain Development Control Program. The Floodplain Development Control Program fulfilled a key term of the Fraser River Flood Control Program Agreement (1968-1995) between BC and Canada, which committed the Province of BC “to a program of land use zoning and flood proofing to diminish potential losses in the area covered by [the] Agreement.”
2003/2004 Legislative Changes and Provincial Guidelines

A major shift in policy occurred in 2003, corresponding with the end of the Floodplain Development Control Program. This policy shift involved a significant change in how the Province of BC participated in land use regulation in flood-prone areas. Since 2003, each local government has had the authority to exercise discretion in developing its own policies for zoning, development permits, subdivision approvals, bylaws and building permits related to flood management. With this shift in 2003, the provincial government published a set of guidelines for municipalities to follow in developing flood bylaws, subdivision approval and associated land use decisions.

The Disaster Financial Assistance (DFA) Agreement states that structures built in an area designated as a floodplain under the Local Government Act must be “properly flood protected” to be eligible for assistance. Historically, “properly flood protected” has meant that all habitable areas of homes and buildings are above the design flood profile (i.e., 1894 Fraser River flood of record or 200-year event elsewhere in BC).

The design flood profile used for these purposes (compensation and DFA regulations) did not include an allowance for sea level rise, subsidence or wave effects. Hence, the provincial guidelines are being updated with an amendment to address sea level rise (SLR).

The draft amendment of the guidelines assumes 0.5 m of global sea level rise by 2050, 1.0 m by 2100 and 2.0 m by 2200 relative to the year 2000.

Flood Management in 2016

Responsibility for flood risk management is shared by all levels of government and by the private sector. The federal government’s contributions have included providing data and earth science information, sharing infrastructure costs for flood protection improvements, sharing flood response/recovery costs (Disaster Financial Assistance) and addressing issues related to reserves under the Indian Act.

The Province of BC creates standards and guidelines and is responsible for processing and reviewing applications under the Dike Maintenance Act, contributes to funding programs for flood protection improvements, is the authority on Crown lands, approves subdivisions in rural areas and provides land use and other guidelines.

Local authorities implement land use planning and regulatory tools, and many also own, operate and maintain dikes. The bulk of flood management (e.g., land use planning and zoning and building of flood protection structures) now rests largely with local governments. The challenges posed by sea level rise further increase the importance of intergovernmental collaboration to address current and future coastal hazards.¹

¹ Arlington report, scan of provincial policies and how they will be adaptable for Climate Change Adaptation
Current Flood Protection Works

Many communities rely on flood protection dikes and associated works such as pumps, floodgates and erosion protection works. As noted in Project 3A (Lower Mainland Dike Assessment), the standards and guidelines associated with dikes in BC have increased in recent years. Many coastal communities, such as Vancouver, West Vancouver and North Vancouver, have had relatively little coastal flooding historically, and dikes were not constructed in these areas. With sea level rise, however, existing developments will be exposed to an increasing coastal flood risk. As well, many First Nations communities, including those in river floodplain areas, are not currently protected by diking systems.

The management of riverbed sediment is considered by some communities as an important tool in the suite of management options. Suggested benefits of riverbed sediment management – or channel maintenance – include maintaining the capacity of the river channel to convey floodwaters, thus avoiding the need to continually raise dikes; “training” the river to remain within, or return to its main channel to relieve erosion pressures from the riverbanks and diking systems; and lowering river levels to alleviate seepage problems. Seepage refers to a situation in which water seeps through or under diking systems, raising water levels on land without a dike being overtopped or otherwise failing.

Current Land Use Planning and Policies

Most communities use land use planning and policies to help limit community vulnerability to flooding. The two primary approaches are flood construction levels and horizontal setbacks. These are typically implemented through bylaws, zoning, development permit areas and other policies and practices.

Growth can be guided away from flood-prone areas, and habitable living space can be built above predicted flood levels with floodproofing practices, such as through the addition of fill to raise the ground elevation or use of structural techniques such as building habitable space above crawlspace, garages and parkades or other design features. Communities may also use risk tolerance criteria, community-wide flood management strategies, subdivision regulations, geotechnical reports, covenants and neighbourhood/area plans as other means of managing development in floodplains.

Current Challenges

These are some of the challenges identified by local governments during interviews and meetings:

Funding Challenges

- How to fund major repairs and upgrades to flood protection works
- How to fund the technical analysis needed to inform optimal infrastructure design and land use decisions
- How to access funding when there is limited ability to cost-share, especially in small communities and rural areas
Policy Challenges

- How to floodproof in historic settlement areas
- How to establish and implement sea level rise planning areas
- How to establish a consistent policy framework to guide diverse communities across the Lower Mainland
- How to plan and manage for changing flood hazards over time, particularly due to sea level rise and other climate change impacts

Land Use Challenges

- How to secure land or rights-of-way to enable dike improvements, changes to dike alignment, or land use change

Priorities and Suggestions

Here are some of the priorities and suggestions raised by local governments and others during interviews and meetings:

Infrastructure and Projects

- Establish and implement a dedicated, multi-year funding program to support the rehabilitation of flood protection works and associated works, such as pumps and flood gates
- Improve regulatory and permitting processes
- Implement more environmentally sound flood management practices
- Profile case examples to raise awareness and learn from best practices
- Initiate new pilot or demonstration projects to learn in the field

Knowledge

- Improve the knowledge base to better inform flood hazard management decisions (e.g., flood hazard mapping, flood vulnerability and risk information)
- Integrate traditional knowledge and local knowledge with scientific and engineering knowledge

Planning

- Strengthen local and regional scale engagement among First Nations, local governments, senior governments, infrastructure providers, environmental and other non-governmental organizations, other stakeholders and the public to profile flood issues, raise awareness and solicit input on management options
- Evaluate management options in relation to diverse economic, social, environmental and technical criteria
- Update flood construction levels and associated bylaws, development permit areas and other policies in relation to changing flood hazards and best available knowledge
- Reconcile the need for regional consistency with flexibility to accommodate unique local circumstances
- Implement more integrated and comprehensive approaches to flood management planning at both local and regional scales
- Develop a long-term plan to manage sediment-related flood and erosion hazards
- Strengthen emergency planning and preparedness functions in the near-term to increase readiness while flood mitigation infrastructure, policies and practices are being strengthened over the short, medium and long-term
- Strengthen internal processes in all organizations such as inter-departmental coordination and cross-fertilization (e.g., engineering, planning, building, environment and emergency management)
- Strengthen regional collaboration and coordination
Innovations and Opportunities

In addition to improvements to existing flood management infrastructure, policies and practices, there is an opportunity to learn from local innovations within the Lower Mainland and beyond.

A variety of management options, governance approaches and emerging innovations are being applied within the region, across North America and around the globe. Some local and global examples that warrant further consideration for the Lower Mainland include:

- Funding mechanisms such as municipal utilities, gas tax funding, reserve funds and green bonds
- Collaboration such as through:
  - Local and sub-regional inter-jurisdictional committees and MOUs
  - Community-to-Community Forums between local governments and First Nations
  - Peer-to-peer learning
- Alternative structural and non-structural approaches to flood management:
  - Setback dikes and fish-friendly pumps
  - Greenshores and other softer approaches to erosion protection
  - Wetlands preservation and restoration to store floodwaters
  - Foreshore lease and other coastal sediment management approaches such as beach nourishment and barrier islands to reduce coastal flood hazards
  - Room-for-the-river options
- Lessons learned from Alberta and elsewhere.

The primary recommendation of the Project 3B analysis to date is to evaluate the full spectrum of historic, current and potential future flood management options using multiple criteria and in relation to a variety of local circumstances across the Lower Mainland. This will be undertaken in Phase 2 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy. Some of the criteria proposed for this evaluation include:

- Benefit-cost analysis and other economic analysis
- Effectiveness and technical feasibility
- Social and cultural considerations
- Environmental considerations.

For more about Phase 2, see Next Steps: Action Agenda for Flood Mitigation in the Lower Mainland on page 36.
Other Updates: Engagement and Communications

There are three advisory committees that helped guide Phase 1 projects, thanks to the contributions of staff representatives from partner agencies and organizations. Each of the committees has met four to six times since May 2014 to provide guidance and receive updates.

As part of its communications outreach, the Fraser Basin Council has also provided regular briefings to the Joint Program Committee on Integrated Flood Hazard Management, which brings together flood management professionals from partner agencies and other organizations with interests in flood management. Since 2014, the FBC has delivered community presentations about the Strategy, on request.

Here is a summary:

- Mission Rotary Club
- Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Seabird Island First Nation
- Community-to-Community Forum of Fraser Valley local governments and First Nations
- Lower Mainland Chambers of Commerce
- Sto:lo Business Match
- Lower Mainland Local Government Association – Flood Committee
- BC Real Estate Association Floodplain Mapping Working Group
- Metro Vancouver Regional Engineers Advisory Committee – Climate Protection Subcommittee
- Agriculture sector meetings
- Ministry of Agriculture staff (Abbotsford)
- FVRD and Fraser Valley municipalities (floodplain management workshop)
- Metro Vancouver Regional Planners Advisory Committee
- People of the River Conference
- Lower Mainland Local Government Association AGM
- Metro Vancouver Lunch & Learn
- MEOPAR Marine Hazards Workshop
- Meetings on Flood Management and the Environment
- Local Government Management Association Conference
- Delta Dikes and Drainage Advisory Committee
- Insurance Bureau of Canada
- Livable Cities Forum
- Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists Conference
- Regional Emergency Planners Committee
- North Shore Climate Adaptation Working Group
- Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference
- Adaptation Canada Conference
Next Steps: Action Agenda for Flood Mitigation in the Lower Mainland

Here is a plan for developing an Action Agenda, proposed by the Fraser Basin Council as Phase 2 (2016-2018) of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy.

**Goal**

To strengthen flood management infrastructure, policies and practices in the Lower Mainland to increase community resiliency and reduce community vulnerability to regionally significant river and coastal flood hazards.

**Deliverable**

An Action Agenda that outlines an agreement among partner organizations about flood mitigation priorities for the Lower Mainland, actions that need to be undertaken, associated costs and a cost-sharing model.

**Project Components**

1. Establish and facilitate a Leadership Committee to provide senior-level strategic advice and oversight on the Action Agenda.

2. Evaluate and recommend national, provincial, regional and local Priorities for Flood Mitigation across the Lower Mainland.

3. Evaluate and recommend optimal Flood Management Options to address the priorities including a diversity of local circumstances across the Lower Mainland.

4. Engage Decision-makers, Stakeholders and the Public to raise awareness and to inform the Action Agenda.

5. Evaluate and recommend one or more Funding and Governance Models for implementation.

6. Confirm Commitments for implementation of the Strategy.

**Description**

1) Establish and facilitate a Leadership Committee to provide senior-level strategic advice and oversight on the Action Agenda.

Phase 1 of the Lower Mainland Flood Management Strategy was overseen by the Joint Program Committee (JPC) for Flood Hazard Management, which was established in 1998. The JPC currently includes over 100 members and alternates representing more than 50 organizations across all orders of government, the private sector and civil society. In 2014, three multi-interest Advisory Committees were established to provide advice and guidance on the three priority areas of Phase 1 of the Strategy, including: Flood Scenarios, Flood Vulnerability, and Flood Management.

To develop the Action Agenda, it is recommended that partners in the Strategy establish a Leadership Committee composed of senior officials from key agencies and organizations that have flood management responsibilities and will be involved in implementing the Action Agenda. The roles of the proposed Leadership Committee would include:

- Providing strategic review and feedback on key aspects of the Action Agenda
- Vetting draft recommendations with senior staff and elected officials prior to adoption for the Action Agenda
- Confirming funding commitments to implement the Action Agenda and,
- Other roles and responsibilities as appropriate.
2) Evaluate and recommend national, provincial, regional and local Priorities for Flood Mitigation across the Lower Mainland.

The Lower Mainland includes urban and rural communities, First Nations and non-First Nations communities; agricultural lands; and many different types of critical infrastructure that serve communities, the region as a whole, and provincial, national, and international interests. It may not be possible to address flood mitigation for all of these aspects of the region in the short-term. It is therefore vital to identify priorities for capital investment and refinements to policies and practices – both in terms of geographic location and timeline (i.e., short, medium and long-term).

The Regional Flood Vulnerability Assessment and the Lower Mainland Dike Assessment (from Phase 1) provide information to assist in identifying priorities during Phase 2. Additional analysis may include:

- Overlaying maps of dike status with vulnerability to highlight the relative status of diking systems in relation to different degrees of vulnerability
- Evaluating direct damages and indirect losses associated with critical infrastructure (this was beyond the scope of work in Phase 1)
- Consulting with all orders of government, utilities and infrastructure, and the private sector to identify additional priorities and,
- Undertaking additional local and regional analyses as needed.

3) Evaluate and recommend optimal Flood Management Options to address the priorities, including a diversity of local circumstances across the Lower Mainland.

Numerous flood management options are available for consideration within the Action Agenda. Traditional, common approaches in the Lower Mainland include flood protection dikes and seawalls, flood gates and pumps, rock riprap, channel maintenance and a range of policies to establish flood construction levels and setbacks for specific land uses and specific flood hazards. These will be examined along with other options such as beach nourishment, barrier islands, greenshores, rolling easements, managed retreat and other emerging policies and practices.

It is important to recognize that there are diverse local circumstances throughout the Lower Mainland, which may require different approaches to flood management. Considerations include:

- Urban and rural community needs
- Coastal and river flood hazard management
- Historic settlements, recent developments, and future growth
- Soil conditions that may impact opportunities for floodproofing or dike improvements
- Available land and rights-of-way to enable dike improvements and/or re-alignment;
- Different jurisdictions, tenures and governance arrangements
- Beach geometry and exposure to wave effects and,
- Many other local and/or site-specific circumstances.
Management options will be evaluated in relation to different local circumstances using several criteria, including, but not limited to the following:

- Effectiveness – How effective is the option at mitigating flood damages?
- Technical Feasibility – Is it feasible to implement the management option or are there technical constraints, such as engineering design, soil conditions, seismic or other geotechnical constraints?
- Cost Estimate – What are the capital costs as well as operations and maintenance costs?
- Benefit:Cost Analysis – What is the ratio of benefits to costs?
- First Nations - What are the interests, suggestions and concerns of First Nations?
- Environment – What are the positive and negative environmental impacts?
- Public and Stakeholder Acceptance – What are the preferences, suggestions or concerns of the public or stakeholder groups?

4) Engage Decision-makers, Stakeholders and the Public to raise awareness and to inform the Action Agenda

Engagement and consultation processes will be undertaken in parallel with the technical analyses outlined above. A combination of meetings, workshops, open houses and other opportunities are envisioned to engage with different decision-makers and stakeholders, including:

- Local government staff and elected officials, including municipalities, regional districts, Lower Mainland Local Government Association and Union of BC Municipalities
- First Nations staff and elected officials
- Provincial and federal government agency staff and elected officials
- Utilities and infrastructure providers
- Other stakeholders (e.g., businesses, industry, agriculture, insurance, real estate and non-government organizations) and
- The public.

5) Evaluate and recommend one or more Funding and Governance Models to implement the Action Agenda.

Limited availability of funding is a fundamental challenge to flood management in the Lower Mainland. Significant financial resources will be required to implement a wide range of management options to address priorities throughout the region. It is vital to review and evaluate a range of potential funding and governance models, which could effectively implement the Action Agenda.

Analysis will be undertaken on historic and current models, such as the Fraser River Flood Control Program and the more recent BC Flood Protection Program. Different models will also be reviewed from other jurisdictions such as Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and the US. In addition to different cost-sharing models, it will also be helpful to assess a range of specific funding mechanisms. This component of the project is critical to answer the following questions:

- Who will pay for flood mitigation in the Lower Mainland?
- What funding sources and mechanisms are most appropriate?
- How will investment decisions be made?

6) Confirm Commitments for implementation of the Action Agenda.

To ensure implementation of the Action Agenda, the process will seek commitments for the funding and commitments from partners to implement the recommended management options within their respective areas of jurisdiction.
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**Desired Outcome of Phase 2:** an Action Agenda that outlines regional priorities where enhanced flood mitigation is needed; recommended management options; and a recommended funding and governance model to implement the Action Agenda (informed by rigorous technical analysis and consultation and advice from diverse partner perspectives).

### Summary of Phase 2 Work Plan and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Projects and Initiatives</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Process / Oversight</strong> – to develop the Regional</td>
<td>Broad-based process to facilitate input, advice and consensus on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, including a Leadership Committee, Joint Program Committee</td>
<td>regional Action Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Advisory Committees (e.g. Technical, First Nations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, Communications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Framework / Vision</strong> – to guide phase 2 (including</td>
<td>A common vision to inform improvements to flood mitigation in the Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles, goals, objectives, targets, criteria and indicators/</td>
<td>Mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance measures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Support Tools</strong> – to review and evaluate different</td>
<td>An agreed upon framework to evaluate and recommend flood mitigation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision support tools and approaches to assist in identifying</td>
<td>for regional priorities and diverse local circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional priorities and evaluating flood mitigation options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on the overall framework developed above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding and Governance Models</strong> – to undertake research on</td>
<td>An agreed upon model for cost-sharing and decision-making in the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different funding and governance models, analysis of applicability</td>
<td>of the Action Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to BC, and recommendations for implementation of the Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic, Multi-Purpose Flood Analysis Tools</strong> – to undertake</td>
<td>Detailed information about the extent and depth of flooding from diverse flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed flood scenario modeling and mapping to better understand</td>
<td>scenarios and the effectiveness of diverse flood mitigation options in local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the extent and depth of flooding in floodplain areas including</td>
<td>floodplain areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse local conditions, to support identification of priorities,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and evaluate the effects of different mitigation options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Technical Analysis</strong> – to help identify potential</td>
<td>Completed analysis to address additional issues as needed (including diking,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“early wins”; evaluate diking systems and policies, sediment</td>
<td>sediment management, land use planning, and other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management practices, and land use planning polices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Nations Engagement</strong> – to integrate advice from First</td>
<td>Detailed information about the interests and advice from First Nations about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations perspectives into the Strategy (including community and</td>
<td>flood vulnerability and flood mitigation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisory meetings, sharing and improving information, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convening workshops)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Management and the Environment</strong> – to integrate advice</td>
<td>Detailed information about how to protect and conserve environmental values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from environmental perspectives into the Strategy (including</td>
<td>through future flood mitigation decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapping and data analysis, advisory committee, regulatory process,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best practices, and workshops)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications</strong> – to raise awareness and understanding about</td>
<td>Numerous communications materials and events to raise awareness and build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flood issues and how the Strategy is working toward implementing</td>
<td>support for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Storm Surge Forecast System</strong> – to support operation for the</td>
<td>A seasonal almanac for potential storm surges and specific storm surge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17 and 2017-18 storm seasons; explore value-added functions</td>
<td>forecasts as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the forecast system to support Strategy development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budget** $2,500,000
### Proposed Cost-Sharing for Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Partner</th>
<th>Confirmed or Proposed Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management BC</td>
<td>$1,000,000 (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Canada</td>
<td>$500,000 (proposed through NDMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada</td>
<td>$400,000 (proposed through FN Adapt program and other programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>$300,000 (proposed to phase 1 partners through Joint Program Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regional Entities (including infrastructure and the private sector)</td>
<td>$200,000 (proposed to phase 1 partners through Joint Program Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Foundation of BC</td>
<td>$120,000 (proposed through REFBC Grant program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Partners</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,520,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
SUBJECT: Municipal Hall Renovation Budget Amendment

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the $5,000 funding previously approved for a new workstation for the part-time tax/utility clerk be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation budget;
2. That the $10,000 funding previously approved for the new workstation for the two new positions in Finance and Inspections be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation budget; and
3. That the financial plan be amended accordingly.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to request funding that was approved for the purchase of required office equipment associated with three new positions to be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation Budget. This will facilitate open and transparent accounting, as the purchase of the new equipment associated with these positions is being coordinated with the Municipal Hall Renovation Project.

BACKGROUND:
Due to a lack of available workstations for the current level of staffing, Council approved funding for a Municipal Hall renovation to open up the floor plans and create additional workspace. Back in 2015, Council also approved funding for a workstation associated with a new part-time tax/utility clerk. In early 2016, Council approved funding for two more workstations associated with two new positions related to the implementation of the Secondary Suite Program; one in Finance and one in Inspections.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
The issue of overcrowding and insufficient number of work stations has been of concern for some time now. The final solution was to renovate Municipal Hall in an effort to manage crowding issues across all departments in one well-planned project. As such, it would be preferred if all associated funding were to be pooled into the renovation project. The associated workstations and equipment were always included in the scope of the renovation project to ensure a coordinated approach, but the funding had not been moved. For this reason, staff are recommending to move the funding associated with the two full-time positions and one part-time position into the Municipal Hall Renovation Project.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
$15,000 of previously approved funding is requested to be moved from their respective accounts into the Municipal Hall Renovation Project account. No increase to the overall project budget is being requested, and no additional funding from reserves is required.
I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:
Project status reports are presented to Council in the second quarter, third quarter, and fourth quarter Engineering and Public Works Capital Project Updates Council reports.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:
Municipal Hall is undergoing a renovation to address crowding issues across multiple departments. Two full-time positions and one-part time position were granted funding for new workstations and associated equipment. It is recommended that this funding be moved into the Municipal Hall Renovation Project budget and associated workstations and equipment be purchased as part of this project.

SIGN-OFFS:

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed

Jay Jackman, Manager of Development Engineering & Projects
Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator
SUBJECT: Landfill Operating Contract
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A - Landfill Operating Cost Breakdown

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:
1. That the 2017-2021 Mission Landfill Operating Contract, in the amount of $857,302 for 2017, be awarded to SSG Holdings Ltd (SSG), including the following additional services:
   a. grinding of dimensional lumber;
   b. mattress recycling at a handling cost of $8.50 per unit, to be offset by a new user fee of $10.00 per unit; and
   c. after-hours site security improvements;
2. That the estimated net budget shortfall of $44,000 be accommodated by a corresponding decrease in the transfer to the Refuse Reserve Fund;
3. That the feasibility and cost of establishing a salvage facility at the landfill be further investigated;
4. That the feasibility and cost of establishing a household hazardous waste facility at the landfill be further investigated; and
5. That the District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
SSG has been operating the Mission Landfill since 1996 and was the only company to submit a proposal for the 2017-2021 Landfill Operating Contract. The RFP called for additional staff resources to streamline operations, alleviate congestion, improve material sorting and diversion, reduce the occurrence of break-ins, provide for dimensional wood grinding and mattress recycling and explore opportunities to establish salvage and HHW facilities. Staff recommends adding mattress recycling and the proposed security features, as well as passing dimensional wood grinding on to SSG. The addition of HHW and salvage facilities requires further research and will be reported back on in 2017.

Compared to 2016 costs ($593,049), the 2017 contract proposal comes at a 31% cost increase for a total of $778,679 at current service levels. In anticipation of a marked cost increase due to higher labour, fuel and equipment costs, staff had allowed for an additional $75,000 for the 2017-2021 Landfill Operating Contract for a 2017 budget of $745,250. Dimensional wood grinding, which had previously been performed by another contractor, will be added onto SSG’s duties at an estimated cost of $52,123, which is slightly below 2017’s budget of $57,834. Adding contract with increased staff at current service levels would create a $33,429 2017 budget shortfall. Adding recommended additional services, such as after-hours security and mattress recycling to SSG’s would result in an overall budget shortfall of 44,018. There was already sufficient budget to include contaminated wood grinding, which will now form
part of the operating contract. Considering additional revenue received from a 2016 surge in tonnages received at the landfill and from a contaminated soil remediation agreement with Summit Earthworks, the $44,018 budget shortfall could be accommodated by a corresponding decrease in the transfer to the Refuse Reserve Fund.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the outcome of the public procurement process for the 2017-2021 Mission Landfill Operating Contract and to recommend award to the incumbent, SSG Environmental, a division of SSG Holdings Ltd.

BACKGROUND:
SSG has held the landfill operating contract for the Mission Landfill since January 1996. The last contract was extended by Council by one year to allow sufficient time for an open procurement process. The current operating contract ends on December 31, 2016. Over the years, SSG has proven to be a diligent, resourceful, cooperative and accommodating contractor to work with.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
Base Operating Contract
Despite the open procurement process, SSG’s was the only proposal received for operating the Mission Landfill. Staff anticipated a cost increase, since the annual CPI increase paid to SSG since 2010 were insufficient to allow for higher labour costs, fuel charges and equipment upgrades, and therefore augmented the 2017 budget by $75,000 in addition to the anticipated CPI increase. At approximately $778,679, the proposed operating cost at current service levels is 31% higher than 2016’s projected expense of $593,049, and exceeds the 2017 budget of $745,250 by $33,429. The cost that was not anticipated in the 2017 budget covers additional staff and operational features to accommodate increased traffic, streamline operations and improve customer service.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) suggested higher staffing levels, i.e., an additional inspector, to reinstate the two recycling bins outside of the scaled area. These bins were intended for rural residents’ dropping off blue-bag recyclables for free. In 2014, they were removed due to excessive contamination, and one of the recycling bins was moved past the scales, so it could be better monitored by the existing site inspector. It displaced one of the formerly four garbage drop-off bins, necessitating more frequent bin exchanges for both garbage and recycling and resulting in periodic congestion at the scales. Moving the recycling bins back to outside of the scaled area would allow customers easier access, reduce the need for multiple trips across the scales and allow for the replacement of the fourth garbage bin at the garbage drop-off area. The additional inspector would be required to monitor the recyclables and metal drop-off area, which is remote from the garbage drop-off area.

The current contract allows for one scalehouse attendant. This staffing level has also been inadequate for quite some time, and the District is currently paying for additional scalehouse attendants on weekends as an extra line item. The new contract will include an additional part-time scale attendant to accommodate times of increased traffic.

The Request for Proposals also included several optional operational components, including:

1. grinding dimensional wood
2. dismantling and recycling mattresses
3. operating an onsite salvage/reuse facility
4. operating an onsite household hazardous waste facility
5. providing for after-hours security

Dimensional Wood Grinding
Dimensional wood grinding has most recently been performed on call by Valley Pulp & Sawdust
Carriers Ltd (Valley Pulp). On-call wood grinding services are a good option, but there can be challenges with the timing and availability of the service provider. In addition to offering a slightly lower cost than Valley Pulp, SSG proposes to keep a horizontal grinder on site, providing for timely grinding services and keeping the wood pile smaller, more manageable, less contaminated and at a reduced fire hazard. Staff therefore recommends including dimensional wood grinding in SSG’s new contract. The estimated 2017 cost of grinding dimensional wood is $53,123, which is slightly lower than the current estimated cost of $53,814 and the 2017 budgeted amount of $57,834.

Mattress Recycling

Mattresses not only present a handling challenge to landfill operators due to their tendency to “float” when buried, most also contain recyclable materials, such as wood and metal. Mattress recycling may be covered under an Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) program in the future; however, until implemented, landfill operations could include mattress recycling at a cost of $8.50 per mattress. Other waste management facilities, including the Langley and Maple Ridge transfer stations, Vancouver Landfill and Bailey Landfill in Chilliwack, have implemented mattress recycling fees in the amount of $15. Due to SSG’s lower cost offering, and the fact that there is some value in the metal recovered from dismantled coil mattresses, staff recommends to add mattress recycling to landfill operations and implement a flat cost recovery fee of $10 per mattress until an EPR program for mattresses takes effect. This fee would exceed cost by $1.50 per mattress, not taking into account potential revenues from recovered metal. While there is no relevant information of the number of mattresses received at the landfill at this time, a rough estimate of 50 mattresses per month would garner $900 in revenue from the unit fee alone.

Onsite Salvage Facility

Staff periodically receives salvage requests for various materials and items at the Mission Landfill, and has been accommodating some at staff’s discretion, mostly on the basis of their being for the greater good or a worthy cause. Customers who wish to salvage items or materials are required to sign a liability waiver, wear proper protective equipment, limit their activities to the beginning of the day and the outside edges of any storage areas. There are also often salvage-worthy and reusable items identified by scalehouse staff or customers when they are dropped off, and there is currently no allowance for anyone taking items from the landfill without prior consent by District staff. Such items include used lumber, furniture, antique metal and wood items and windows.

Staff’s discussions with SSG on establishing and running a salvage facility have highlighted some potential barriers, such as logistics, potential liabilities, time commitments and cost. Potential liabilities could likely be minimized by excluding certain items from salvage, such as electrical equipment, children’s toys and safety equipment. Customers wishing to salvage an item could also be asked to sign a generic waiver, saving the District harmless from any claims. There could be a small, per-item charge ($1 to $5) to compensate for the weight discrepancy, where customers are salvaging items at the same time that they are dropping off materials. In order to assess logistics and firm up SSG staff time and cost, it is recommended to run a month-long trial and report the findings back to Council for a decision in 2017.

Household Hazardous Waste Facility

While the annual Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Day in May offers an opportunity to residents to dispose of such materials once a year, establishing a HHW facility at the Mission Landfill would enable year-round accommodation of loads containing HHW and prevent it from potentially being dumped elsewhere. There may be opportunities to share the capital cost of constructing such a facility with industry stewards, such as the BC Used Oil Management Association and Product Care, and staff proposes to further explore opportunities.

SSG quoted an annual cost of $33,600 to operate a HHW facility, which would cover a part-time attendant. This cost is higher than the annual HHW day, which is currently held in May at an
approximate cost of $20,000. SSG’s quote does not include the expense of having HHW collected for processing, which could be significant. However, there is the option of only including HHW that is covered under a provincial Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) program, such as domestic paint products, used oil, fluorescent light tubes and electronics, similarly to what is currently accepted at the Mission Recycling Depot on Mershon Street. Staff proposes to further investigate the various options for adding some form of a HHW facility to the Mission Landfill and report the findings to Council in 2017.

**After-hours Security**

Despite a security camera system, an electrified bear fence and an 8-ft chainlink fence along Dewdney Trunk Road with razor wire on top, break-ins continue to be a nightly occurrence at the landfill. Burglars are reportedly mainly looking for high-value metal and marijuana residuals. A security company currently provides on-site security services for one random night a week only, which is only marginally effective. The current cost of this is approximately $8,740 per year.

Rather than employing a full-time, onsite night guard for the site, SSG’s proposal includes operational adjustments, such as a commitment to removing CFCs and copper piping from refrigeration equipment, emptying garbage bins at the end of the day and using steel plates to cover metal bins and the active face of the landfill at the end of each day. The capital and replacement costs of adding steel plates to the active face and steel lids on metal bins form part of the proposed base operating cost, as does the CFC removal. The operational part of placing and removing steel plates is quoted at $26,400 per year.

Staff recommends accepting SSG’s proposal for improved security features, rather than continuing with sporadic on-site security or incurring the cost of a full-time onsite night guard at the site.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The financial implications of awarding the 2017 to 2021 Landfill Operating Contract, in the amount of $857,302, to SSG have been discussed throughout this report. Projected five-year operating costs assuming an annual 2% CPI increase are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Operating Costs</td>
<td>$857,302</td>
<td>$874,448</td>
<td>$891,937</td>
<td>$909,776</td>
<td>$927,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 – Five-year Operating Cost Projection*

As per the District’s Purchasing Policy, Council approval is required to award the contract. Appendix A provides a breakdown of the current and proposed operational costs, and the 2017 budgeted amounts.

In summary, the 2017 budget includes $813,284, including dimensional wood grinding, to maintain current service levels at the Mission Landfill. Adding recommended services, such as after-hours security and mattress recycling would result in an overall cost of $857,302, leaving a budget shortfall of $44,018, which could be made up by a corresponding decrease in the transfer to the Refuse Reserve Fund. The impacts on the projected balance in the Refuse Reserve Fund over the five-year contract term are shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Refuse Reserve Fund Balance</td>
<td>$1,989,946</td>
<td>$1,648,640</td>
<td>$2,043,498</td>
<td>$2,507,908</td>
<td>$3,040,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impact of Cost Increase</td>
<td>(44,000)</td>
<td>(88,000)</td>
<td>(132,000)</td>
<td>(176,000)</td>
<td>(220,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Refuse Reserve Fund Balance</td>
<td>$1,945,946</td>
<td>$1,560,640</td>
<td>$1,911,498</td>
<td>$2,331,908</td>
<td>$2,820,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 – Five-year Impacts on Refuse Reserve Fund*

Staff will further consider the ongoing impact of the contract cost increase when reviewing waste management utility rates during the preparation of the 2018 financial plan.
I have reviewed the financial implications
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

COMMUNICATION:

Any changes to landfill operations concerning Mission taxpayers, such as the addition of a mattress recycling user fee, the potential establishment of a salvage and/or HHW facility will be advertised on social media, the District’s website and in the local paper.

SIGN-OFFS:

Jennifer Meier, Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by:
Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering & Public Works

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:
Reviewed
## Appendix A
### Landfill Operating Cost Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Cost &amp; Service Level Options</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>2017 Proposed Cost</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>2017 Budget Discrepancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Site Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Operating Cost</td>
<td>$553,764</td>
<td>$771,600</td>
<td>$735,895</td>
<td>$35,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-off Bin Rental</td>
<td>$3,864</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Handling</td>
<td>$9,724</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>$7,171</td>
<td>-$7,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Out-of-District Materials</td>
<td>$9,071</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Special Materials (e.g., ACM)</td>
<td>$5,176</td>
<td>$7,079</td>
<td>$2,184</td>
<td>$4,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Weekend Scalehouse Staff</td>
<td>$9,450</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[estimated] Vegetation Control</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[estimated] Pond Scarification</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[estimated] Bear Fence Maintenance</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>included</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Cost at Current Service Levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>$593,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>$778,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>$745,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,429</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Optional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensional Wood Mgmt</td>
<td>$53,814</td>
<td>$53,123</td>
<td>$57,834</td>
<td>-$4,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-hours Security</td>
<td>$8,743</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost for Optional Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68,034</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,489</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress Recycling Cost</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress Recycling Revenue</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost for Mattress Recycling</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-$900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost of Operating Contract with Recommended Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$857,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$813,284</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,018</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred Optional Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvage Facility Operation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$46,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHW Facility Operation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hourly Rates for Extra Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalehouse Operator</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Truck &amp; Operator</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$152</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loader &amp; Operator</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer &amp; Operator</td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mower</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this report is to brief Council on the current status of the 2016 budget, and provide a projection of the District’s overall financial results to December 31, 2016. This report is provided for information only, no staff recommendation accompanies this report and Council action is not required.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to brief Council on the current status of the 2016 budget, and provide a projection of the District’s overall financial results to December 31, 2016.

BACKGROUND:
As part of the District’s financial reporting system, budget status reports occur on the quarters ending June, September and December, to provide Council with timely information in terms of the District's overall financial performance.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
This financial review is for the nine month period ending September 30, 2016. Attached to this report are the following appendices:

- Appendix “A” summarizes year-end projections on a departmental basis for the general operating fund, and provides budget variance explanations where the variance is +/- $10,000 or 10%.
- Appendix “B” summarizes year-end projections for the utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations, along with budget variance explanations where the variance is +/- $10,000 or 10%.
- Appendix “C” summarizes year-end projections for the capital budget and provides budget variance explanations for all unfavourable variances.
- Appendix “D” is an update on departmental service levels for the period ending September 30, 2016 with estimated service level projections for 2017.
- Appendix “E” summarizes the transactions funded from the general operating fund contingency account and the Mayor’s contingency account.
Current projections indicate that by year-end the general operating fund will meet overall budget targets and have a surplus projected of approximately $680,000. It should be noted that certain events can occur between now and year-end that may materially affect this projection, and some costs are more closely ascertainable or quantifiable at year-end. Regardless, departments will continue to closely monitor their spending for the remainder of the year.

**General Operating Fund Projected Year-end Results**

The following table summarizes the projected year-end budget results on a departmental basis for the general operating fund, as detailed in Appendix “A,” along with variance explanations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END BALANCE</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,248,438</td>
<td>803,028</td>
<td>-445,410</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Planning</td>
<td>1,126,218</td>
<td>873,803</td>
<td>-252,415</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>2,400,592</td>
<td>2,160,742</td>
<td>-239,851</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services - Inspections</td>
<td>147,033</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>-107,689</td>
<td>-73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>10,444,126</td>
<td>10,339,017</td>
<td>-105,110</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>2,190,856</td>
<td>-78,557</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Purchasing</td>
<td>1,514,220</td>
<td>1,435,746</td>
<td>-78,474</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services</td>
<td>1,727,651</td>
<td>1,688,955</td>
<td>-38,696</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>528,569</td>
<td>490,695</td>
<td>-37,874</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>778,790</td>
<td>748,802</td>
<td>-29,988</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations</td>
<td>3,290,108</td>
<td>3,265,867</td>
<td>-24,241</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>551,678</td>
<td>546,601</td>
<td>-5,077</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>2,666,872</td>
<td>2,664,054</td>
<td>-2,818</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>275,699</td>
<td>276,883</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>44,162</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>948,089</td>
<td>957,264</td>
<td>9,175</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy</td>
<td>-31,968,465</td>
<td>-31,926,670</td>
<td>41,795</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>2,011,313</td>
<td>2,089,274</td>
<td>77,961</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630,768</td>
<td>630,768 *</td>
<td>&gt;100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Budget Surplus**

0  -680,809  -680,809

* Historically, Departments’ salary savings resulting from vacant position, sick time and WorkSafe claims have been able to offset this deficit. Staff continue to monitor this issue and will report back in 2017 on the strategies in place.

Negative variances = Under budget
Positive variances = Over budget
The following areas have a projected variance of greater than $100,000 to one or more projects that departments are monitoring:

- The planning department is projecting an increase to planning fees collected in 2016 by approximately $200,000 and the inspections department is projecting an increase in building permit fees by approximately $105,000 as development activity continues in Mission.

- The engineering department is projecting an increase to the subdivision inspection fees collected in 2016 by approximately $270,000 as development activity continues. The department is projecting salary savings from vacant positions in 2016.

- Interest from investments is projecting an increase of approximately $250,000 as we receive favorable rates on our portfolio. Approximately $130,000 will be transferred to the reserves.

- Land sales and gaming revenue are projecting an increase of $220,000 and $140,000 respectively, which are entirely transferred to the Land Sale and Gaming reserves.

- Payroll Overhead has two areas of concern. Based on the first nine months of 2016, sick leave is projected to be 21% over the budget. The over budget projection, estimated at $140,000, will be reflected in many departments as budget savings from illness. The second area of concern is the WorkSafe BC rates, which have increased 15% for municipal staff and 40% for Forestry staff in 2016. The over budget projection, estimated at $130,000, was unexpected.

- Secondary dwelling program is estimated to generate an additional $150,000 in the water operating funds, $110,000 in the sewer operating fund, $28,000 in garbage levy and $10,000 in recycling fees. Staff continue to receive exemption and decommission applications for processing thus these revenue increases may be reduced by the end of the year.

- Landfill disposal revenue is projected to exceed budget revenue by approximately $740,000. This excess revenue is partially offset by an increase to the projected landfill closure and post closure costs that resulted from the Design and Operating study, will increase the transfer by approximately $780,000.

- The equipment pool is projecting lower revenue from the sale of surplus equipment sales of approximately $109,000 as the sale of several large units (3 tandem trucks) have been postponed to 2017.

### Utility Operating Fund Projected Year-end Results

The following table summarizes the projected year-end transfer to reserves for the utility funds and the equipment replacement reserve as detailed in Appendix “B”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Operating Fund</th>
<th>Budgeted Transfer to Reserve</th>
<th>Projected Transfer to Reserve</th>
<th>Projected Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>113,583</td>
<td>900,532</td>
<td>-786,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2,893,249</td>
<td>3,250,959</td>
<td>-357,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Pool</td>
<td>700,942</td>
<td>718,767</td>
<td>-99,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>1,198,309</td>
<td>1,579,036</td>
<td>-380,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,003</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Negative variances = Additional Transfer to Reserves*

*Positive variances = Reduced Transfer to Reserves*
All utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations are projecting higher transfers to reserves than budgeted.

**Capital Fund Projected Year-end Results**

All areas within the general capital and the utility capital programs are within budget target, (see Appendix “C”).

**Departmental Service Levels**

The attached Appendix “D” shows the year-to-date service levels for each department in comparison to the prior years’ service levels and the projected service levels for 2016 and 2017.

**General Operating Fund Contingency Account and the Mayor’s Contingency Account Transactions**

Appendix “E” summarizes the transactions, approved by Council, that were funded from the 2016 general operating fund contingency account and the one transaction from the Mayor’s contingency.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

General Operating Fund: The general operating fund is projecting a surplus. Should a surplus in fact be realized at year-end, as projected, staff will present a report outlining options for Council to consider once the year-end accruals and adjustments have been completed.

Utility Funds and Equipment Pool Operations: The utility funds and the equipment pool operations are projecting higher transfers to reserves than anticipated.

Capital Fund: The capital fund projects are all estimated to come within budget targets.

**COMMUNICATION:**

No communication action is required.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:**

The financial review for the first nine months of 2016 (ending September 30, 2016) summarizes the year-end projections at the department level along with budget variance explanations, where required.

Current projections indicate that by year-end the general operating fund will have a surplus. It should be noted that certain events can occur between now and year-end that may materially affect these projections, and some costs are more closely ascertainable or quantifiable at year-end.

There are eight project areas that have a projected variance of greater than $100,000 that departments are carefully monitoring.

All utility operating funds and the equipment pool operations are projecting higher transfers to reserves than budgeted.

All areas within the general capital and the utility capital programs are within budget targets.

**SIGN-OFFS:**

Kerri Onken, Deputy Treasurer/Collector  
Reviewed by:  
Kris Boland, Director of Finance

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer:  
Reviewed  
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### General Operating Fund Summary

September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>2016 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS *</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END BALANCE</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE $ (a)</th>
<th>% VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Revenue</td>
<td>-234,016</td>
<td>-172,105</td>
<td>-216,543</td>
<td>17,473</td>
<td>-7% Reduced demand for burials, partially offset by reduced expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Expenditures</td>
<td>273,671</td>
<td>169,687</td>
<td>260,705</td>
<td>-12,967</td>
<td>-5% Reduced demand for burials, offset by reduced revenues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>-2,418</td>
<td>44,162</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Grants Revenue</td>
<td>-223,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-223,300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Grants Expenditures</td>
<td>775,128</td>
<td>657,816</td>
<td>769,901</td>
<td>-5,227</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>551,578</td>
<td>657,816</td>
<td>546,601</td>
<td>-5,077</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration Revenue</td>
<td>-123,790</td>
<td>-31,911</td>
<td>-79,542</td>
<td>44,248</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration Expenditures</td>
<td>2,393,203</td>
<td>1,849,774</td>
<td>2,270,398</td>
<td>-122,805</td>
<td>-5% Transfer from gaming revenue for downtown security reduced as security is focusing on Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,269,413</td>
<td>1,817,863</td>
<td>2,190,856</td>
<td>-78,557</td>
<td>-3% Reduction in Downtown security to focus mainly on Library. Evening Council meetings have been shorter reducing overtime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Land Development Revenue</td>
<td>-118,800</td>
<td>-29,616</td>
<td>-118,416</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Land Development Expenditures</td>
<td>394,499</td>
<td>213,301</td>
<td>395,299</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275,699</td>
<td>183,685</td>
<td>276,883</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Revenue</td>
<td>-418,375</td>
<td>-692,505</td>
<td>-787,942</td>
<td>-369,567</td>
<td>88% Increased revenue from fees related to higher than expected increase in development. Higher Soil removal fee revenue and royalties offset by increase transfer to reserve below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Expenditures</td>
<td>1,666,813</td>
<td>1,072,938</td>
<td>1,590,970</td>
<td>-75,843</td>
<td>-5% Budget savings from vacant positions partially offset by higher transfer to reserve from increased soil removal revenue and royalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,248,438</td>
<td>380,433</td>
<td>803,028</td>
<td>-445,410</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Revenue</td>
<td>-139,481</td>
<td>-137,444</td>
<td>-167,417</td>
<td>-27,936</td>
<td>20% Increase in property sales in Mission results in increased revenue from tax certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Expenditures</td>
<td>1,653,700</td>
<td>1,324,572</td>
<td>1,603,163</td>
<td>-50,537</td>
<td>-3% Delays in hiring vacant positions resulted in budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,514,220</td>
<td>1,187,128</td>
<td>1,435,746</td>
<td>-78,474</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Revenue</td>
<td>-172,658</td>
<td>-9,917</td>
<td>-164,911</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>-4% Position partially vacant for the year resulted in budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Operations Expenditures</td>
<td>3,462,767</td>
<td>2,558,824</td>
<td>3,430,758</td>
<td>-32,009</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,290,108</td>
<td>2,548,908</td>
<td>2,365,867</td>
<td>-24,241</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government Revenue</td>
<td>-6,258,812</td>
<td>-5,687,966</td>
<td>-6,821,445</td>
<td>-562,633</td>
<td>9% Investments performing higher than anticipated, partially offset by transfer to reserve. Land sales, Community Amenity fees and gaming revenue higher than anticipated, offset by transfer to reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government Expenditures</td>
<td>8,659,405</td>
<td>3,917,203</td>
<td>8,982,187</td>
<td>322,782</td>
<td>4% Increase in transfers to reserves from increased revenue partially offset by reduced debt servicing costs, insurance claims and post retirement benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,400,592</td>
<td>-1,700,764</td>
<td>2,160,742</td>
<td>-239,851</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services Revenue</td>
<td>-686,538</td>
<td>-759,306</td>
<td>-794,226</td>
<td>-107,688</td>
<td>16% Increase in building permit and inspection fee revenue from market activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services Expenditures</td>
<td>833,571</td>
<td>660,428</td>
<td>833,570</td>
<td>-107,689</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147,033</td>
<td>-98,878</td>
<td>39,344</td>
<td>-107,689</td>
<td>-73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings Revenue</td>
<td>-111,016</td>
<td>-95,696</td>
<td>-115,961</td>
<td>-4,944</td>
<td>4% Budget savings in Police building, Municipal Hall and Fire Hall 1, partially offset by increased costs to Public Works building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings Expenditures</td>
<td>889,807</td>
<td>652,278</td>
<td>864,763</td>
<td>-25,446</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>778,790</td>
<td>556,582</td>
<td>748,802</td>
<td>-29,988</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Revenue</td>
<td>-150,677</td>
<td>-98,226</td>
<td>-104,864</td>
<td>45,813</td>
<td>-30% Revenue from restaurant delayed late due to renovations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Expenditures</td>
<td>1,098,766</td>
<td>901,615</td>
<td>1,062,128</td>
<td>-36,638</td>
<td>-3% Staff vacancies resulted in budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>948,089</td>
<td>803,389</td>
<td>957,264</td>
<td>9,175</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Recovery</td>
<td>-6,630,256</td>
<td>-5,129,948</td>
<td>-6,168,937</td>
<td>461,319</td>
<td>-7% Insufficient overhead rate to cover off all expenses for 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Overhead Expenditures</td>
<td>6,630,256</td>
<td>5,527,303</td>
<td>6,799,705</td>
<td>169,449</td>
<td>3% Sick time utilization to September 30th is approximately 91% of annual budget. WorkSafe Bc premiums rate is increased by over 21%. Partially offset by savings in health and dental costs and WorkSafe claims in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>397,355</td>
<td>630,768</td>
<td>630,768</td>
<td>&gt;100% Historically, Departments' salary savings resulting from vacant position, sick time and WorkSafe claims have been able to offset this deficit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected Results are calculated from the Projected 2016 Year-End Balance.*
## General Operating Fund Summary

**September 2016, Fall Budget Review**

### DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>2016 YEAR-TO-DATE RESULTS</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END BALANCE</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Revenue</td>
<td>-450,595</td>
<td>-443,320</td>
<td>-660,385</td>
<td>-209,790</td>
<td>47% Increase in development fees received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Expenditures</td>
<td>1,576,813</td>
<td>1,124,001</td>
<td>1,534,188</td>
<td>-42,625</td>
<td>-3% Vacant positions have resulted in budget savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,126,218</td>
<td>680,680</td>
<td>873,803</td>
<td>-252,415</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Revenue</td>
<td>-743,458</td>
<td>-674,029</td>
<td>-744,521</td>
<td>-1,063</td>
<td>0% Saving in the RCMP contract and Restorative Justice program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services Expenditures</td>
<td>11,187,584</td>
<td>5,757,477</td>
<td>11,083,538</td>
<td>-104,046</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,444,126</td>
<td>5,083,448</td>
<td>10,339,017</td>
<td>-105,109</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Revenue</td>
<td>-726,397</td>
<td>-324,551</td>
<td>-710,200</td>
<td>16,197</td>
<td>-2% Revenue from bus services are lower than projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Expenditures</td>
<td>2,737,710</td>
<td>1,926,339</td>
<td>2,799,474</td>
<td>61,764</td>
<td>2% Increase in BC Transit costs due to unexpected repairs and maintenance partially offset by reduction in expected commuter rail and train bus costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,011,313</td>
<td>1,601,988</td>
<td>2,089,274</td>
<td>77,361</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Revenue</td>
<td>-54,812</td>
<td>-46,312</td>
<td>-80,611</td>
<td>-25,800</td>
<td>47% Unexpected money from ICBC for signal head upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Expenditures</td>
<td>2,722,684</td>
<td>2,025,734</td>
<td>2,744,666</td>
<td>22,982</td>
<td>1% Higher than anticipated costs for road related expenses partially offset by reduction to sign vandalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,666,872</td>
<td>1,979,422</td>
<td>2,664,054</td>
<td>-2,818</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Revenue</td>
<td>-347,961</td>
<td>-123,417</td>
<td>-385,460</td>
<td>-37,499</td>
<td>11% Unexpected grant funding received for 125th Anniversary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration Expenditures</td>
<td>876,530</td>
<td>655,373</td>
<td>876,155</td>
<td>-375</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>528,569</td>
<td>531,956</td>
<td>490,695</td>
<td>-37,874</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Revenue</td>
<td>-2,228,342</td>
<td>-1,915,284</td>
<td>-2,393,676</td>
<td>-165,334</td>
<td>7% Increased revenue from strong Club Kids participation, new programs &amp; unexpected grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services Expenditures</td>
<td>3,955,993</td>
<td>3,333,631</td>
<td>4,082,631</td>
<td>126,638</td>
<td>3% Increase program attendance results in higher program costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,727,651</td>
<td>1,418,347</td>
<td>1,688,955</td>
<td>-38,696</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/Grants In-Lieu Revenue</td>
<td>-32,003,465</td>
<td>-32,017,098</td>
<td>-31,951,670</td>
<td>51,795</td>
<td>0% Reduction in property tax revenue as a result of outstanding property appeal partially offset by an increase to Grants-in-Lieu and penalty revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/Grants In-Lieu Expenditures</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>19,924</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
<td>-29% Interest paid to pre-authorized customers lower than originally estimated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-31,668,465</td>
<td>-31,997,173</td>
<td>-31,926,670</td>
<td>41,795</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected General Operating Fund Balance = 0

-680,809

-680,809

*2016 Year to Date Results includes expenditures posted up to November 9, 2016.

(a) Negative variances represent higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.
## Utility Operating Funds and Equipment Pool Operations Summary

**September 2016, Fall Budget Review**

### FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 YEAR TO DATE RESULTS</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END BALANCE</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ (a)</td>
<td>$ (b)</td>
<td>$ (c)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Utility Operating Fund

#### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local System Revenue</td>
<td>-6,340,959</td>
<td>-6,284,506</td>
<td>-6,696,359</td>
<td>-355,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional System Revenue</td>
<td>-18,008</td>
<td>-18,210</td>
<td>-21,124</td>
<td>-3,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Operating Revenue</td>
<td>-6,558,967</td>
<td>-6,402,716</td>
<td>-6,907,483</td>
<td>-358,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local System Expenditures</td>
<td>2,394,630</td>
<td>1,915,557</td>
<td>2,427,827</td>
<td>33,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional System Expenditures</td>
<td>1,071,087</td>
<td>1,082,645</td>
<td>1,038,698</td>
<td>-32,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>3,465,717</td>
<td>2,998,202</td>
<td>3,466,525</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfer to Water Capital Reserve Fund

|                         | -2,893,249                 | -3,304,514                      | -3,250,959         | -357,709             |
|                         |                            |                                 |                    | 12%                  |

Increased revenue is related to the Secondary Dwelling Unit charges, water service connections and interest from investments (most interest revenue is transferred to reserves). Increase in Land Sales revenue.

#### Sewer Utility Operating Fund

#### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local System Revenue</td>
<td>-4,280,464</td>
<td>-4,133,408</td>
<td>-4,450,417</td>
<td>-169,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional System Revenue</td>
<td>-331,983</td>
<td>-326,806</td>
<td>-424,273</td>
<td>-92,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Operating Revenue</td>
<td>-4,612,447</td>
<td>-4,460,214</td>
<td>-4,874,690</td>
<td>-262,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local System Expenditures</td>
<td>2,158,574</td>
<td>1,617,776</td>
<td>2,067,852</td>
<td>-90,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional System Expenditures</td>
<td>1,255,564</td>
<td>1,236,211</td>
<td>1,227,802</td>
<td>-77,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfer to Sewer Capital Reserve Fund

|                         | -1,298,309                 | -1,606,227                      | -1,579,036         | -380,727             |
|                         |                            |                                 |                    | 32%                  |

Increased revenue due to secondary dwelling unit revenue not budgeted for and higher return on investments (most interest revenue is transferred to reserves). Industrial surcharge fees higher than anticipated.

### Drainage Utility Operating Fund

#### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1,704,938</td>
<td>-1,712,099</td>
<td>-1,722,484</td>
<td>-17,546</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,504,938</td>
<td>1,251,823</td>
<td>1,522,481</td>
<td>17,543</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfer to Drainage Reserve Fund

|                         | -200,000                   | -460,275                        | -200,003           | -3                   |
|                         |                            |                                 |                    | 0%                   |

Higher storm sewer and access permit admin fee than anticipated partially offset by a decrease in private access installation revenue.

### Waste Management Utility Operating Fund

#### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4,327,977</td>
<td>-4,656,171</td>
<td>-5,096,500</td>
<td>-768,324</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,214,394</td>
<td>3,062,758</td>
<td>4,195,969</td>
<td>-18,425</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfer to Refuse Reserve Fund

|                         | -113,583                   | -1,593,413                      | -900,532           | -786,949             |
|                         |                            |                                 |                    | 69%                  |

Higher refuse disposal tonnages and acceptance of contaminated soil for remediation/temporary storage has resulted in higher revenues. Lower costs for landfill operations, environmental investigations and testing are mostly offset by increased projections for landfill closure and post closure cost as identified in the Design and Operating plan of 2016 that was not budgeted for.

### Equipment Pool Operations

#### Operating Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2,654,865</td>
<td>-2,032,065</td>
<td>-2,569,601</td>
<td>85,264</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (a)</th>
<th>$ (b)</th>
<th>$ (c)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,035,842</td>
<td>1,980,722</td>
<td>1,850,834</td>
<td>185,008</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfer to Equipment Reserve Fund

|                         | -619,023                   | -51,343                         | -718,767           | -99,744              |
|                         |                            |                                 |                    | 16%                  |

Net of lower revenue and expenditures is projecting an increase to the transfer to replacement reserve.

*2016 Year to Date Results includes expenditures posted up to November 9, 2016.

(a) Negative variance represents higher revenue in the revenue section and lower expenses in the expense section.

(b) Negative variance represents more funds available to be transferred to reserve than what was originally budgeted. Positive variance represents less funds available to be transferred to reserve than what was budgeted.
## General Capital Budget Variance Summary

### September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END SPEND</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED BUDGET CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTED BUDGET USAGE $</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE $</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>3,788,296</td>
<td>3,218,385</td>
<td>481,273</td>
<td>3,699,658</td>
<td>(88,638)</td>
<td>-2% Gill Ave bridge approach was able to be completed under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>539,318</td>
<td>374,715</td>
<td>77,179</td>
<td>451,994</td>
<td>(87,324)</td>
<td>-16% Edwards Street soil stabilization was able to be completed under budget, Safety Review Grade Railway Crossings resulted in only one of four crossings being the District’s responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Buildings</td>
<td>1,350,971</td>
<td>1,252,895</td>
<td>98,076</td>
<td>1,294,951</td>
<td>(56,076)</td>
<td>-4% Various projects under budget: RCMP building envelope, generator and parking lot, Fire Hall #2 roof replacement, Municipal Hall seismic study, and library HVAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Corporate Projects</td>
<td>637,863</td>
<td>496,409</td>
<td>32,494</td>
<td>609,905</td>
<td>(11,548)</td>
<td>-5% Silver Creek Industrial Business Park broadband internet connectivity canceled due to access right challenges of conduit structure between two telecommunication companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>4,184,548</td>
<td>4,146,216</td>
<td>38,332</td>
<td>4,184,551</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>0% Fraser River Heritage Park observatory removal project completed under budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Administration</td>
<td>364,367</td>
<td>252,232</td>
<td>111,789</td>
<td>364,021</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>0% Minor savings on printer replacements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>563,947</td>
<td>543,947</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>566,947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Operations</td>
<td>227,384</td>
<td>227,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>227,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>69,990</td>
<td>43,190</td>
<td>26,800</td>
<td>69,990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>22,286</td>
<td>20,128</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>22,282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Purchases</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,623</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>10,982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Services</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,684</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Capital Projected Budget Variance 10,618,191 930,511 11,548,702 (269,038) -10%

## Utility Funds and Equipment Replacement Capital Budget Variance Summary

### September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>FINAL/AMENDED 2016 BUDGET</th>
<th>PROJECTED 2016 YEAR-END SPEND</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED BUDGET CARRY FORWARD</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTED BUDGET USAGE $</th>
<th>PROJECTED VARIANCE $</th>
<th>VARIANCE EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Pool</td>
<td>1,487,316</td>
<td>1,102,427</td>
<td>384,803</td>
<td>1,487,230</td>
<td>(86)</td>
<td>0% Minor fleet equipment replacement savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water</td>
<td>2,176,764</td>
<td>1,159,383</td>
<td>1,017,381</td>
<td>2,176,764</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Sewer</td>
<td>3,429,534</td>
<td>1,085,530</td>
<td>2,344,004</td>
<td>3,429,534</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Sewer</td>
<td>1,346,518</td>
<td>1,256,518</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>1,346,518</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Water</td>
<td>2,566,337</td>
<td>1,334,881</td>
<td>1,231,456</td>
<td>2,566,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>859,275</td>
<td>546,250</td>
<td>313,025</td>
<td>859,275</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>276,971</td>
<td>151,442</td>
<td>125,529</td>
<td>276,971</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative variances = Under budget  
Positive variances = Over budget
## Service Levels
### September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Cemetery</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of full burials</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cremation burials</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of columbarium burials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>233%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Corporate Administration</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bylaws prepared (prepared rather than adopted)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Regular Council Committee of the Whole meetings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Closed Council meetings</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Special Council meetings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Freestanding Committee of the Whole meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information Requests</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of media releases</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook / Twitter followers combined</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>151%</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement Surveys</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Responses</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major public events (Open House, Town Hall etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>163%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities - Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Information Technology</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of calls for service processed (estimated)</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of calls for service processed - RCMP (estimated)</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of computers supported (including remote computers)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hits on the website</td>
<td>348,135</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>298,017</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activities - Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Human Resources</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of internal postings (unionized)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of external recruitments</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>187%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of corporate training opportunities provided to staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees participating in corporate training</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Levels - Building Inspection and Bylaw Enforcement</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Days from Complete Building Permit (BP) Appl. rec’d to BP issuance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days from Demo Permit Appl. rec’d to Permit issuance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>333%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days from Sign Permit Appl. rec’d to Permit issuance*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>240%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dog licenses issued (2016 issued on behalf of FVRD)</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tickets issued</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Inter-municipal Business Licenses issued</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Length of time for issuance of sign permits can increase when incomplete and/or incorrect drawings are submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Building Inspection and Bylaw Enforcement</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast Sept 30/16</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of business licenses issued</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Businesses</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupation</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX "D"

### Service Levels

**September 2016, Fall Budget Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>163%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - Cont'd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Residential building permits issued</td>
<td>$28,846,714</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$23,343,079</td>
<td>156%</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Industrial/Commercial/Institutional (ICI) building permits issued</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Industrial/Commercial/Institutional building permits issued</td>
<td>$2,652,230</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$4,890,719</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of demo permits issued</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10 Year Building Permit History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential Numbers</th>
<th>Residential Dollars</th>
<th>Commercial Numbers</th>
<th>Commercial Dollars</th>
<th>Industrial Numbers</th>
<th>Industrial Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$28,846,714</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,876,430</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$22,614,727</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$3,280,537</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$17,341,560</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$4,381,183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$12,670,842</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$4,606,350</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$17,176,013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$12,201,621</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,726,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$19,814,532</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$6,679,820</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$18,663,107</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,661,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$23,820,736</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$811,601</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$8,493,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>$42,376,049</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,953,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$26,317,260</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,024,237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>$27,743,972</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$10,944,001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>$48,956,542</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,793,904</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$508,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$36,470,569</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$4,620,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$28,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Service Levels - Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># days to issue PAR letters*</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>167%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># days 3rd reading to PLA issuance (Rez w. SD)**</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># days all referrals received to PLA issuance (SD only)</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># days from complete application received to public hearing</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>149%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complex or detailed development proposal often involve several meetings and further discussion with applicants to ensure accurate and detailed information is being provided.

#### Activity Levels - Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Lots created</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Units created</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rowhouse lots created</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># PAR Meetings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>177%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Rez, SD, OCP, DP, DVP applications</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>213%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ECONOMIC/LAND DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of business inquiries responded to*</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of businesses contacted for retention purposes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of active businesses older than 10 years**</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of promotional trade shows attended</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes management of land use, business license, lease, and land and building purchase inquiries.
### Service Levels

**September 2016, Fall Budget Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Engineering</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Street Use Permits issued</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Extraordinary Traffic Permits issued</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hydrant Use Permits issued</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Filming Permits issued</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Public Works</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt rehabilitated (square meters)</td>
<td>91,500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>45,805</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sidewalk installations (kilometers)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of major road repairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of dike maintenance/upgrades</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Finance</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable invoices processed</td>
<td>10,276</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>7,881</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable electronic funds transfer processed</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable cheques produced</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable invoices generated</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing card invoices processed</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT payments received from customers</td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of BC On-Line Tax Certificate requests</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Payroll</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Direct Deposits (average per bi-weekly pay)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of T4s</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Record of Employments issued</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Purchasing</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of purchase orders issued</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of competitive processes administered</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing card spending</td>
<td>$485,089</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$290,298</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central stores sales</td>
<td>$396,626</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$321,208</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central stores inventory value on hand</td>
<td>$101,309</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$137,665</td>
<td>172%</td>
<td>$129,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(inventory value can fluctuate due to capital plan and seasonal needs creating higher value in the summer)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Fire Operations and Emergency Programs</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fire Calls</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Related Incidents</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Emergencies</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue (MVA, Electrical, Rope, etc.)</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>146%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Investigation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fire, Medical and Emergency Calls</strong></td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Life Safety Inspections</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Public Life Safety Education</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>196%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Paid-on Call Fire Fighters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Career Fire Fighters</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke Alarm Campaign, homes visited</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Civic Buildings maintained</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICE SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of prisoners</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Record Checks</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital fingerprints obtained</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure Requests</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Files processed</td>
<td>17,139</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>12,517</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Statements transcribed for court purposes</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime Prevention Office - Administration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Enquiries</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/meetings</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime Prevention Office - Operational:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Watch: Number of vehicles checked</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning letters issued</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles viewed for auto crime</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles scanned thru Stolen Auto Recovery (SAR)</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,889</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Bus Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of &quot;in service hours&quot; per year</td>
<td>109,121</td>
<td>108,405</td>
<td>82,103</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>108,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly average ridership</td>
<td>2,344,903</td>
<td>2,372,840</td>
<td>1,734,013</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2,372,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy-Dart Service Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of &quot;in service hours&quot; per year</td>
<td>27,015</td>
<td>27,116</td>
<td>20,436</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>27,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly average ridership</td>
<td>105,285</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>77,991</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>107,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECREATION, PARKS and CULTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parks maintained</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of urban trails maintained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Properties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space (approximate hectares)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** BC Transit reporting is quarterly and at this time only one of quarter data is available. YTD amounts are estimated.

"In-Service Hours" are only provided annually from BC Transit.
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### September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION, PARKS and CULTURE, Cont’d</th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Sept 30/16</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leisure Centre visits - membership</td>
<td>128,044</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>95,914</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pre-registered programs - unlicensed</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>8,738</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>7,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pre-registered programs - licensed (Club KIDS)</td>
<td>21,956</td>
<td>22,131</td>
<td>17,473</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>22,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Leisure Centre drop in visits</td>
<td>67,632</td>
<td>64,249</td>
<td>43,968</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pool visits*</td>
<td>202,908</td>
<td>201,290</td>
<td>156,704</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>201,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fitness room visits*</td>
<td>91,878</td>
<td>94,127</td>
<td>56,698</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>94,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Youth Lounge visits</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of special events (offered through or participation in)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of limited income access passes (PLAY pass)</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overlap may occur, as many patrons often participate in both swimming and fitness during visit. Pool stat includes spectators and swim lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities - Social Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Mission citizens served in Mission Connect</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>180%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Service Agencies at Mission Connect</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants in Youth Fest</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Service Agencies at Youth Fest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service agencies participating in the Mission Outreach Network</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Annual Connect Events</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faith Organizations involved with Social Development projects and events</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAXATION/GRANTS IN LIEU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Taxation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties on pre-authorized payment plan</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Tax Notices mailed to property owners</td>
<td>14,102</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>14,251</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>14,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of penalties processed</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of property deferment applications</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of retro home owner grants processed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of delinquent properties January 1st</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of delinquent properties July 1st</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of delinquent properties at tax sale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT POOL OPERATIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities - Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fleet assets</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of licensed vehicles in fleet</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of work orders completed</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of work orders not completed</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>223%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Preventative Maintenance services</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Commercial Vehicle Inspections</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Fire Apparatus Pump Tests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litres of unleaded E10 used by District fleet</td>
<td>77,488</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>62,301</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litres of B5 biodiesel used by District fleet</td>
<td>174,879</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>151,023</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers driven by District vehicles *</td>
<td>627,230</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>504,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Kilometers are estimates. Fleet conducts an annual kilometer of equipment use for the fleet. Findings over past years do not indicate a great variance between years for total kilometers driven.
## Service Levels
### September 2016, Fall Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 Actuals</th>
<th>2016 Forecast</th>
<th>2016 YTD Actual</th>
<th>% of Forecast</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEWER UTILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities - Sewer Utility Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains television inspected (kilometers)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains flushed (kilometers)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Every second year (2015, 2017, 2019, etc.) a flush is performed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WASTE MANAGEMENT UTILITY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities - Waste Management &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate (buildings &amp; Fleet) Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost Diversion (curbside food &amp; yard waste &amp; landfill green waste)</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside Garbage</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside, Landfill, Recycling Centre Recyclables</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of loads received at Landfill</td>
<td>58,669</td>
<td>59,739</td>
<td>62,412</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>59,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of loads received from account customers</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>8,646</td>
<td>386%</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of loads received from cash customers</td>
<td>56,057</td>
<td>57,099</td>
<td>53,766</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>57,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-area Customers</td>
<td>56,107</td>
<td>57,288</td>
<td>56,033</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>57,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-area Customers</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>543%</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal/curbside/free tipping</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>All data reported in tonnes.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WATER UTILITY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities - Water Utility Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water main lines cleaned (kilometers)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC watermain replaced (meters)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ICI water meters read (quarterly)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of residential water meters read (annually)*</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>254%</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fire hydrants receiving semi-annual maintenance</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties screened for leak detection</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results: Leaks located &amp; repaired - Service Leak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>240%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaks located &amp; repaired - Water main leak</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meter reads for property sales</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meter re-reads for ICI</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Residential meters are read in October each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DRAINAGE UTILITY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities - Drainage Utility Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of Storm Mains TV Inspected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilometers of Storm Mains Flushed</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Catchbasins Cleaned and Inspected</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Every second year (2015, 2017, 2019, etc.) a flush is performed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX "E"

## District of Mission

### General Operating Fund Contingency and Mayor's Contingency Transactions

#### General Operating Fund Contingency Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2016 Contingency Budget</strong> $38,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Operating Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Dec-15</td>
<td>RC15/668</td>
<td>Community Cares: Mental Health Training - Community Special Grant (3,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Fee For Service Partnerships Grant budget increase (7,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Community Special Grants budget increase (400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/054</td>
<td>Community Enhancement Grants budget increase (150)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Nov-16</td>
<td>C2016/213</td>
<td>Property Taxes/Utilities for District owned property (4,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/073</td>
<td>Hope for Freedom Society supportive recovery facility donation (4,897)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>RC16/099</td>
<td>Hospice Donation for renovations (2,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Jun-16</td>
<td>RC16/307</td>
<td>2016 Pulling Together Canoe Journey - Sponsorship of a meal (1,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Jun-16</td>
<td>RC16/345</td>
<td>Concrete repair &amp; site prep for Welcome Stairs Mural (Welton) (2,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Approved for Operating Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance of General Operating Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mayor's Contingency Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2015 Mayor's Contingency Budget</strong> $2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Apr-16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Purchased plants to enhance buffer</td>
<td>(892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance of Mayor's Contingency:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: November 21, 2016
TO: Mayor and Council
FROM: Stacey Crawford – Economic Development Officer
SUBJECT: Delivery of Tourism Services and Formation of an Independent Destination Marketing Organization
ATTACHMENT: Appendix A: Strategic Tourism Plan, Mission, BC

The purpose of this report is to provide information about a four-year transitional plan to develop a stand-alone industry managed Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) for the development and delivery of tourism services in Mission.

If Council adopts the staff recommendation noted below, further direction from Council is required as to the preferred funding model, including the desired rate of Municipal and Regional District Tax, and when to implement the DMO considering the near completion of the 2017 budget process.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Council consider and resolve:

1. That the establishment of an independent Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) be supported; and
2. That the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce manage the interim administration and formative process of the DMO.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

As per council direction, the economic development mandate is shifting its emphasis to be more directly focused on business retention, expansion and investment attraction efforts by removing film and tourism responsibilities to stand-alone sector development initiatives managed more directly by industry-specific representation. For tourism, recent council direction and tourism stakeholder sessions have determined this will be most effective in the form of a stand-alone industry led Destination Marketing Organization (DMO).

As such, this report provides a brief analysis of the independently prepared Strategic Tourism Plan, Mission, BC, hereinafter referred to as “the strategy” and attached as Appendix A. The strategy explores the options available to council, culminating in recommendations to support the establishment of a stand-alone DMO. In addition to the attached material, a presentation highlighting stakeholder engagement, research findings and opportunities associated with the strategy will also be provided to council by the principals of Connect Media and Slap Communications, the consulting team engaged to undertake the development of the strategy.
PURPOSE:
The purpose of this report is to receive direction from council on the establishment and four-year funding agreement of a stand-alone DMO, recognizing the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce as the interim administrative body until the DMO is formally established in 2017.

BACKGROUND:
As determined in the research findings, Mission is one of the only communities of its size in South Western British Columbia operating without a funded Destination Marketing Organization (DMO). Because of this, Mission is not able to effectively compete with communities in the Fraser Valley to attract tourism investment and visitors to support a growing tourism industry.

The strategy takes into consideration tourism industry stakeholder input, the 2010 Mission Tourism Plan, and recent successful practices from other communities, such as Hope and Chilliwack, to present an updated comprehensive strategy that is current and reflects the unique needs of Mission.

It considers Mission’s competitive advantage and opportunities within the regional context, explores target markets and leverages existing partnerships and infrastructure to propose new marketing tactics, brand positioning and new ways to measure progress.

The strategy proposes a four-year timeframe that begins with a managed transition through the Chamber (Board of Directors and Tourism Committee), evolving in 2017 into a competitive stand-alone DMO. The revenue model is diverse, including provincial tourism program support, retail sales, pay-to-play advertising programs, and various grants and municipal support. In the fourth year (2020), the municipal and regional district tax (MRDT) received through the sale of short-term accommodation is anticipated as a new revenue source.

The District will play a critical funding role for the formation of the DMO, providing a total of $670,000 over the first four years. $80,000 of this is already budgeted, leaving a funding requirement of $590,000. While the initial new investment is $190,000 in the first year, this reduces to $90,000 in the fourth year. The importance of the initial investment relates to the initial staffing and marketing resources required to draw interest and create a stable operating platform from which the DMO can establish itself. These new monies are in addition to the existing $20,000 provided under an existing fee-for-service agreement to provide visitor services at the Visitor Information Centre (VIC). It is proposed that the VIC will become a component of the new DMO as it is not sustainable under its current operating structure.

As well, to better understand how other communities fund and operate their tourism development services, and to determine what level of direct support the municipalities contribute, a competitive assessment of neighbouring municipalities was conducted, which demonstrates significant differences in revenue generation and direct municipal support.

Also proposed is a governance structure for the DMO with 8 to 10 representatives. The new Board of Tourism would be an industry-led governance body and would also include District representation to be determined by council.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:
As council has recognized, the tourism industry continues to play a significant role in the BC economy in terms of revenue earned by tourism businesses, tourism activities, and the creation of employment opportunities. Furthermore, council has a direct interest in the success of tourism development in Mission due to the District’s ownership of key assets that include Stave West and Fraser River Heritage Park, amongst others.
The following information considers various points of view and is intended to assist council in their deliberation of support for the four-year strategy that moves tourism to a stand-alone DMO with interim management responsibilities provided by the Chamber of Commerce.

1. **Destination Marketing Organization:**
   a. The idea of forming a stand-alone DMO was identified through stakeholder engagement in the 2008 Mission Tourism Plan funded and facilitated by the Community Tourism Foundation, an arm of Tourism BC (now Destination BC). It was further validated in 2010, and most recently in August of 2015 with council and tourism stakeholders.

   While the purpose and value of forming a DMO to better represent and promote tourism in Mission remains clear, the issue of appropriate resources and capacity continues to limit any significant progress towards achieving this objective.

   b. To address the resources and capacity shortfall, several partnerships involving the District, the Chamber and municipalities involved in the Scenic 7 partnership have worked together over the years to advance the tourism agenda. However, due to recent changes in the provincial funding model, along with changes to temporarily eliminate municipal funding for our Scenic 7 partners in Pitt Meadows and restructuring to establish a municipally funded tourism development function in Maple Ridge, limited funding has been secured for 2016-2017, further aggravating efforts.

   c. One issue to be aware of is that while the Chamber is an appropriate fit and is amenable to acting as the interim management group while the DMO is in its formative stage, the need for a stable funding source over the first four years will be of the upmost importance. Should the strategy be supported by council, interim funding support from the District for expert staffing, marketing and DMO development activities will be critical to the DMO’s stability. Without appropriate resources to establish the DMO, it will struggle to become firmly established and will not likely succeed.

   d. In the event that additional resources from the municipality are not a consideration during the formation stage of the DMO, council may wish to consider temporarily or permanently suspending tourism as a sector of interest at this time and have efforts focused more directly on other priorities and objectives.

2. **District tourism assets**
   The District also has tourism related assets that should be considered as part of this discussion. The potential associated with areas like Stave West and Fraser River Heritage Park will likely require the District to continue to invest resources in these assets and, as such, other considerations for council could include:

   a. The DMO act in a shared management and/or programming role to support tourism related activities associated with these assets to achieve both the strategy and any specific tourism development objectives identified by the municipality to develop these important assets.

3. **Potential risks**
   a. Supporting the strategy
      i. The establishment of an independent DMO will remove any direct involvement
of the District in managing tourism development services. While the District will be providing funding to the DMO, it will have only a limited say in the use of those funds. Council can mitigate this concern by maintaining a representative on the new DMO board of directors.

ii. The gross project cost of the strategy over the four-year timeframe is $1.222 million. Including the MRDT (hotel tax) in year four, there is $552,000 in revenues from other sources included in the plan. This represents a high dependency on other sources for approximately 45% of the anticipated DMO revenues.

In the event of a significant revenue shortfall during this formative stage, the DMO may be required to delay or suspend certain components of the plan until resources are available to continue with implementation.

Mitigating factors to these risks include the consistency of DBC (Province) in providing provincial funding to communities on an annual basis during the past 13 years for tourism programs and marketing initiatives. The BC Jobs Plan currently lists Tourism as one of the eight key sectors of focus, recognizing tourism as one of the fastest growing industries in BC. This source is deemed stable and, combined with provincial VIC funding, accounts for approximately 70% of all other annual revenue sources identified in the strategy. The remaining 30% is made up of pay-to-play and retail programs, plus the MRDT in year four.

b. Not supporting the strategy

i. Should the decision be to not support the strategy, there is a risk of losing the support and engagement of local and regional tourism industry stakeholders. The sentiment would likely be that this is another failed attempt of the stakeholders to structure a solution. Consequently, it will be difficult for any remaining coordinated interest to pursue the MRDT, or access provincial funding through Destinations BC, as this requires partnering with neighbouring municipalities or representative DMO’s. Funding of this nature requires matching dollars and a recognized representative body (municipality/DMO), making coordinating or partnering on initiatives more difficult.

4. Alternatives

i. Subject to input from the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce, an alternative may be to maintain the current Visitor Information Centre to provide basic visitor information services on behalf of the municipality.

While this may be an alternative, it should be recognized that the Chamber's current level of service for the VIC is limited to 965 hours per year, with a $20,000 fee-for-service received from the District and approximately $12,000 received from the province. This results in offering visitor services on limited hours per week, which is inadequate, requiring the Chamber to increase operating hours around key events (i.e. Fraser Valley Bald Eagle Festival) and specific months of the year when visitor traffic is highest.

The VIC occupies approximately 80% of the floor area on the main level of the Chamber of Commerce; however, the Chamber must absorb the operating costs associated with this presence, offset staff wages, absorb any marketing
costs and deal with continuous interruptions of staff from visitors during periods when the VIC is not technically operating.

While it has been stated that the current fee-for-service and provincial VIC funding is not adequate to provide ongoing visitor information services when Chamber staff time and operational expenses are considered, it may present an opportunity for the District to increase funding support for the VIC to maintain a more adequate level of service expectation. This alternative may be less of a financial commitment than the formation of an independent DMO, but would be subject to willingness and negotiation with the Chamber.

Similar to Item 1(d,) above, in the event that additional resources from the municipality are not a consideration for the VIC under this scenario, council may wish to consider temporarily or permanently suspending tourism as a sector of interest at this time and have efforts focused more directly on other priorities and objectives.

COUNCIL GOALS/OBJECTIVES:

Development of the strategy follows the direction of council to explore the formation of an independent DMO following the removal of tourism from the economic development department, as well as addressing the following 2016 – 2018 council strategy:

- Objective 5.3: Develop District tourism strategy report cards

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Should council pursue the implementation of a stand-alone DMO, it is estimated to require $590,000 in new monies over four years, along with the existing tourism fee-for-service budget of $20,000 annually, for a total four year commitment of $670,000. A breakdown of the financial implications are as follows:

- Details of the $590,000 additional investment over 4 years:
  - The ongoing annual cost to the District of supporting the DMO is estimated to be $110,000, even after including estimated revenue from a 2% MRDT, commonly referred to as a hotel tax. $20,000 is currently budgeted for tourism through the tourism fee-for-service grant. Therefore a $90,000 ongoing annual funding increase is required to support the DMO. This ongoing funding increase totals $360,000 over 4 years.
    - Staff recommends that this should come from an ongoing funding source, not from reserves;
    - This could be funded by an approximate 0.3% tax increase, however council has just completed the 2017 budget deliberations. Council may want to consider if this project should be postponed for consideration during the 2018 budget discussions;
    - Council could consider requesting a 3% MRDT instead of 2% for an additional $30,000 annual revenue to partially offset the $90,000 increase in the municipal contribution;
  - Also, $230,000 of start-up funding is required over the first 3 years while the DMO gets established, $100,000 in year 1, $80,000 in year 2, and $50,000 in year 3.
    - This could come from the gaming reserve fund, which has an available balance of $234,000 at the end of 2016. However, this would use most of the available gaming reserve funds.
  - As stated, the gross project cost of the strategy over the four-year timeframe is $1,222
million. Including the MRDT (hotel tax) in year four, there is $552,000 in revenues from other sources included in the plan.

The most significant source of other funds is DBC (Province). Combined with the annual VIC funding, this accounts for approximately 70% of all other annual revenue sources identified in the strategy. The remaining 30% is made up of pay-to-play and retail programs, plus the MRDT in year four.

The benefit to the District investing in the DMO is difficult to quantify. However, as demonstrated in the strategy, direct and indirect economic benefits to local businesses are considerable as a result of trends associated with increased visitor traffic in BC and the region, provided a coordinated and appropriately resourced marketing engine is established to coordinate partnerships, develop tourism products and promote the community as a preferred destination. There may be additional opportunities associated to this effort should the municipality wish to coordinate responsibilities with Stave West, Heritage Park, Experience the Fraser and other municipal tourism assets.

COMMUNICATION:

Should the recommendation be approved, external communication and coordination will begin through the Chamber of Commerce, who will initiate the process to establish an independent Destination Marketing Organization. Communication efforts associated with this responsibility will be managed by the Chamber.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

Every day, economic opportunity is lost due to a lack of organizational support between the existing tourism stakeholders and business community within Mission. As a result, Mission is at a disadvantage to our neighbouring municipalities, yet our community is more closely aligned with the brand and vision Destination British Columbia has established to promote the Province.

As such, the stakeholder group determined that action was required to create a sustainable plan that allows our community and tourism stakeholders to have, at the very least, the same competitive advantage as any other community in the Fraser Valley. To achieve this, the group agreed that a strategy and implementation plan needs to be built to form a stand-alone DMO that address and promotes our competitive advantages.

The formation of an industry-driven stand-alone DMO will require an initial four-year funding commitment from the municipality to support the establishment of this function. The Chamber will coordinate and manage the formation of the group.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mission has been unable to attract tourism investment and high-volume visitors to support a healthy tourism industry, to the extent desired or planned for. This is not because Mission isn’t a viable tourism destination but, rather, because the community lacks the identity, infrastructure, funding, and support required. Previous strategic tourism plans have been created; however, they were not executed to their full extent. In 2015, the Economic Development office and Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce were approved to create an updated, sustainable tourism plan.

To address the formation of an independent DMO (Tourism Mission), and the development of a comprehensive and sustainable tourism strategy that best reflects Mission’s unique needs and utilizes proven best practices, Riley Forman, Principal of Connect Media, and Summer Dhillon, Principal of Slap Communications were contracted to prepare this plan.

With the goal of feeding into a long-term framework, this tourism plan proposes a four-year timeframe that is founded on four pillars: research, marketing, finances, and governance. It addresses the need for a diverse funding model that minimizes and, eventually, eliminates the need for direct municipal investment and maximizes the direct economic value that tourism will bring to the municipality of Mission. The strategic plan does not focus on tourism product development but, rather, highlights current products and services, while revealing areas of opportunity for further product development. It is a living document and part of an ongoing strategic planning process.

The content of this strategic plan was based on literature review of online resources, such as tourism trends and market research provided by Destination BC, primary research collected at individual and group stakeholder sessions, and competitive and perceptual evaluations, positioning Mission against other Fraser Valley and Lower Mainland communities.

Research revealed that visitors are looking for destinations, offering value and serving as a fun or relaxing getaway from everyday life. The increasing interest in seeking out memorable, authentic experiences with social and cultural interactions, and the appeal of nature in an, increasingly, urban world, are additional trends that will help Mission to be recognized as a viable tourist destination.

Visitor types are, primarily, leisure travellers, Free Independent Travellers (FIT), and groups via RV Caravans. As BC tourism becomes more competitive, destinations will increasingly look to the execution of strong brands and development of unique product experiences to differentiate themselves and entice new visitors.

Using the combined Hope, Mission, and Harrison Hot Springs 2015 Visitor Centre Statistics as an indicator, Highway 7 sees the most same-day visitors, followed by one-day visitors, two-day visitors, and less than 1% stay for four days or longer. Top requests from visitors include site facilities, transportation, attraction/tours, investment/moving, parks, and adventure recreation.

Tourism product experiences include the Fraser River (fresh-water fishing including world-renowned sturgeon fishing), mountain landscape (hiking trails, road cycling, and mountain biking), backcountry (regional and provincial parks, bird and wildlife viewing, kayaking and canoeing, and the equestrian community), attractions (Mission Raceway, Powerhouse at Stave Falls, Mission golf course, Cascade Suspension Bridge, and the Westminster Abbey), boutique shops, spas, galleries, cafés, restaurants and pubs, artisans, history, festivals and celebrations. Stave West is a proposed multi-faceted tourism product that has great potential.
Geographically, the Mission Visitor Information Centre (VIC) is poised to be the official headquarters of the Scenic7BC corridor, in part due to the proximity to the Abbotsford International Airport and Canada/USA border crossings but, also, due to its center position along the highway. This highway receives high traffic volume and the VIC benefits from these numbers. The Mission VIC is a stand-alone Visitor Information Centre in terms of operations, but requires financial support as it is subsidized by the MRCC.

Once Mission has, effectively, positioned itself in the tourism marketplace, the tools will be available to help evolve Mission into a major tourism hub in the Fraser Valley. This plan reflects the need to merge the VIC with destination marketing efforts as it will allow Mission’s tourism industry to build quickly.

Identified consortium competitors include the Fraser Valley portion of Highway 1 and the Sea-to-Sky Highway. Both represent alternate road trips/day-trips within close proximity to the Metro Vancouver and Fraser Valley markets.

Destination BC initiatives that may impact Mission include the launch of the new tourism brand’s (Supernatural) creative and guidelines, an application-based, consortium-focused provincial Co-operative Marketing Partnerships Program, the Experiences BC program. Mission has tourism products that will be attractive to authentic experiencers, cultural explorers, and free spirit types.

Through the Tourism Advisory Committee, the MRCC has helped to lead marketing tactics. However, due to a lack of resources, results have been minimal. The formation of an independent DMO must be followed by a robust marketing strategy.

Objectives include promoting Mission as an attractive tourist destination, increasing tourism awareness, encouraging tourism development and implementing sustainable tourism strategies, aiding tourism projects and businesses that are in alignment with this strategy, diversifying tourism product by encouraging experiential tourism, growing visitation to increase overnight stays during shoulder seasons, strengthening community partnerships, and leveraging sector marketing organizations.

Measurement includes monitoring overnight visitation and length of stay, employment, accommodation revenue, awareness, interest, conversion from target markets, and calculating a Net Promoter Score.

Significant funding will be required for Mission, not only to achieve its tourism objectives, but to compete with more established destinations in BC. A minimum annual budget of approximately $360K (including staffing and the operation of the Visitor Centre) is needed. It is recognized that Mission will need to reach the $360K budget level in Year 4 and it would to start the $215K level. Funding ideas include business permit fees/levies for vacation rentals and Air BnBs in addition to Municipal and Regional District Tax (MRDT) collection.

This plan suggests removing tourism services from the Economic Development Office and introduces the MRCC as the interim body to manage the transition. The not-for-profit society (DMO) would be a stakeholder model, and the make-up of the Tourism Advisory Committee and of the Board of Directors will be an issue of in-depth discussion. The proposed structure involves 8-10 members including hotel managers, one seat from the MRCC, one seat from the EDO, and representatives from other sectors. Board appointees would require a minimum of two years of service to be eligible.


Mission has a story that the world deserves to hear. Its competitive advantages are strong and are sure to attract new visitors and redirect traffic from neighbouring communities as they come to explore mission with eat, play, and stay.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Mission has been unable to attract tourism investment and visitors to support a healthy tourism industry, to the extent desired or planned for. This is not because Mission isn’t a viable tourism destination but, rather, because the community lacks the identity, infrastructure, funding, and support required to capitalize on this multi-million-dollar industry. Further, neighbouring Destination Marketing Organizations (DMOs), such as Tourism Harrison and Tourism Abbotsford, cannot collaborate with Mission, to the fullest extent possible, translating to missed, cost-effective opportunities. The irony is that Mission is more in alignment with Destination BC’s (DBC) Supernatural Brand than most of the Fraser Valley communities. Every day that passes, economic opportunity is lost.

Previous strategic plans have been created to propel the City of Mission towards tourism. In 2008, stakeholder engagement sessions were held and facilitated by the Community Tourism Foundation—an arm of Destination BC—which was further validated in 2010 and, most recently, in August 2015. However, they were not executed to their full extent. Various reasons contribute as to why the strategies were not implemented, but the bottom line was attributed to a lack of resources and funding. In 2015, and on the direction of Mission Council, the Economic Development office was given the green light to create an updated sustainable tourism plan with the goal of ‘making it happen’.

The District of Mission and Council recognize that tourism continues to play a significant role in the BC economy with respect to revenue, not only earned by tourism businesses and activities, but, also, by the creation of employment opportunities and the ripple effect that benefits the entire community collectively. Tourism has a direct impact on the development of restaurants, resorts, hotels, bed and breakfasts, galleries, outdoor recreational facilities, heritage parks, historical sites, golf courses, and more. It fuels revenues in the retail and transportation sectors, and contributes to audience numbers for concerts, theatre productions, and festivals. Along with their pocketbooks, visitors and staycating residents bring enthusiasm and excitement to the communities they visit, while also helping locals appreciate their own backyards.

To address the formation of an independent DMO (Tourism Mission), and the development of a comprehensive and sustainable tourism strategy that best reflects Mission’s unique needs and utilizes proven best practices, the Economic Development Office (EDO) and the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC) contracted Riley Forman, Principal of Connect Media, and Summer Dhillon, Principal of Slap Communications.

With the goal of feeding into a long-term framework, this tourism plan proposes a four-year time-frame that is founded on four pillars: research, marketing, finances, and governance. It addresses the need for a diverse funding model that minimizes and, eventually, eliminates the need for direct municipal investment and maximizes the direct economic value that tourism will bring to the municipality of Mission.

The strategic plan does not focus on tourism product development but, rather, highlights current products and services, while revealing areas of opportunity for further product development. True to a DMO’s role, a DMO promotes a city, region, or country with the objective of attracting more tourists and business travellers which, in turn, generates overnight lodging, visits to restaurants, and shopping revenues. DMOs are typically funded by taxes, and are responsible for marketing the destination brand through travel and tourism product awareness.

---

1 2015 figures are not available now. In 2014, the tourism industry generated $14.6 billion in revenue, a +5.1% increase from 2013 and a +37.7% increase over 2004. In 2014, $1.7 billion of accommodation room revenue was earned in participating communities with the Municipal Regional District Tax (MRDT), an increase of +9.0% from 2013. The tourism industry contributed $625 million in provincial taxes, a decrease of -7.6% from 2013 and an increase of +13.2% from 2004. In 2014, $3.9 billion in export revenue was generated, an increase of +3.7% over 2013. Tourism generated a direct contribution to BC’s gross domestic product (GDP) of $7.1 billion (2007 constant dollars), an increase of +4.5% from 2013 and a +13.1% increase over 2007. Source: www.destinationbc.ca/getattachment/Research/Industry-Performance/Value-of-Tourism/Value-of-Tourism-in-British-Columbia-(2014)/Value-of-Tourism-2014_Final-Report-2014_FINAL.pdf.aspx

2 The shortfall between revenue and expenses was covered by the EDO’s marketing budget. Budget was significantly reduced in 2015. The Mission EDO has no ability to contribute tourism marketing dollars moving forward.
Last, it must be noted that this plan is a living document and part of an ongoing strategic planning process. There is a pressing need to, continually, review the objectives as the external and internal environments are rapidly changing.

Mission has a story that the world deserves to hear. Its competitive advantages are strong and are sure to attract new visitors and redirect traffic from neighbouring communities as they come to #explorecbc and #exploremission with ‘eat, play and stay’.

1.2 MISSION’S OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN (OCP)

Mission’s commercial and industrial sectors have seen slow, but steady, growth in recent years, supported by stability in the residential sector. The commercial sector has expanded with the addition of the Junction Shopping Centre, improvements to the Mission Hills Shopping Centre, and the upsurge of retail businesses opening in the Downtown core. While Mission is constrained by a lack of strategically located and serviced industrial land, the 2005 development of the Silver Creek Business Park created opportunities for industrial and business usage.

Mission has excellent transportation infrastructure to support the development of its commercial and industrial sectors, with direct access to Highway 7 and Highway 11, and, although indirect, it is only 10 to 15 minutes away from Highway 1, and the U.S. Interstate No. 5. Mission is also supported by the existence of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the West Coast Express commuter rail, and its proximity to the Abbotsford International Airport.

One of the most significant opportunities is the potential to develop Mission’s waterfront area as a mixed-use residential, commercial, institutional, and light-industrial area. Mission has an abundance of natural beauty that is conducive to sport-fishing, hiking, camping, and resort-community development among other tourism development opportunities.

Identified tourist attractions include the Fraser River, Stave Lake, Rolley Lake Provincial Park and the Municipal Forest, Mission Raceway Park, Westminster Abbey, Clarke Foundation Theatre, Xa:ytem Longhouse, Mission Museum, Mission Music Festival, and the Power House at Stave Falls. It was acknowledged that while these local attractions possess significant tourism appeal, there is a need for more effective joint marketing efforts to attract more destination-type tourism traffic to the area.

It was further stated that Mission has the potential to become the gateway for the ‘Mighty Fraser Country’, and to become a staging area for a wide range of outdoor recreational pursuits, including sport fishing, boating, camping, hiking, and horseback riding. A strong ecotourism sector would complement arts, culture, and heritage tourism.  

---


Mission’s economy faces a limited supply of industrial and business park lands, a shortage of local employment opportunities, challenging issues relating to maintaining a strong downtown, and its proximity to a major regional commercial centre being Abbotsford. Despite these challenges, there is an atmosphere of optimism for Mission’s future that is supported by Council’s objectives as outlined in Council’s 2016-2018 Strategic Plan.

1. Enhanced lifestyle opportunities and community health.
2. Improved public safety.
3. Excellence in financial management and planning.
4. Optimized planning and management of assets and infrastructure.
5. Effective economic development.

Objectives 1 and 5 are of greatest interest to the proposed tourism strategic plan.

---

**FIGURE 2: TOURISM PLANNING PROCESS**

- **SITUATION ANALYSIS**
  - “What are the challenges and opportunities?”

- **PLANNING SESSIONS**
  - Stakeholder engagement

- **OBJECTIVES**
  - “What are we going to achieve?”

- **STRATEGIES**
  - “What is our plan of attack?”
  - Includes market and destination development strategies

- **TACTICS & IMPLEMENTATION**
  - “What are the specific activities?”
  - Includes market and destination development strategies

- **MARKET DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

- **DESTINATION DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

- **IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES**

- **TRACKING & EVALUATION**
  - “How are we doing?”
1.3 METHODOLOGY

The content of this strategic plan was based on:

- literature review of online resources, such as tourism trends and market research provided by Destination BC.
- primary research collected at individual and group stakeholder sessions.\(^5\)
- competitive and perceptual evaluations, positioning Mission against other Fraser Valley and Lower Mainland communities.

1.4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS

Connect Media and Slap Communications facilitated individual and group stakeholder sessions in spring of 2016. On a separate occasion, Peter Harrison, Director of Partnership Marketing with DBC, met with Mission hoteliers to explain the structure and benefits of Municipal Regional District Tax (MRDT) also known as hotel tax. The purpose was to explain the re-awakening of Mission and the significance of creating a DMO and launching a sustainable tourism strategy.

It was made clear that the stakeholders were unenthusiastic and concerned that another plan would be shelved and collect dust. However, it was emphasized that the MRCC, Mission EDO, Connect Media, and Slap Communications felt confident as the District of Mission has shown support in moving forward. Stressing the economic benefits of tourism, and how Mission is positioned for growth, the stakeholders were asked to share their concerns, feedback, and thoughts regarding Mission’s identity. See Appendix C for a full list of attendees.

---

\(^5\) The MRCC and Mission EDO office supplied an inventory of tourism businesses to support the Situation Analysis and overall direction.
2.0 SITUATION ANALYSIS

2.1 STUDY AREA

Visitors do not distinguish a destination by known boundaries, whether geographical or political. The given study area consists of the district municipality of Mission (Mission Proper), and surrounding backcountry regions, such as Hayward Lake, Stave Lake, Rolley Lake, and Cascade Falls. Mission is situated on the north bank of the Fraser River where it backs onto mountains and lakes, overlooking the Central Fraser Valley and Fraser River. It is 70 kilometres east/southeast of Vancouver and is BC’s 23rd largest municipality with a population of approximately 38,000 people. Mission is accessible via the West Coast Express, a Monday to Friday commuter rail that transports Mission residents to and from Vancouver and other communities on the north side of the Fraser.

2.2 KEY INSIGHTS

These key insights were extracted from the Situation Analysis, which is provided in full in Appendix A (Operating Environment) and Appendix B (Visitor Analysis).

MARKETS

Overall, the tourism sector is seeing growth in Canada and BC. The low Canadian dollar encourages BC tourists to remain in Canada who are responding favourably to staycations and value-based messaging. The strongest geographical market has been identified as BC residents, in particular those from Metro Vancouver and the Fraser Valley. Key activities, which motivate trips to the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains tourism region are sightseeing, nature, wildlife viewing, visiting parks, and friends or relatives.

WHAT ARE VISITORS LOOKING FOR?

Visitors to any BC region are looking for destinations, offering value and serving as a fun or relaxing getaway from everyday life. Mission has these attributes. BC tourists are most likely to plan a trip during spring, off the heels of a cold, wet, and dark winter.

The most recent example, within the Fraser Valley, of even a day activity that invited thousands of visitors from across the Lower Mainland, Vancouver Island, and Pacific Northwest was the Abbotsford Tulip Festival, which lured over 90,000 people. Tourism Abbotsford supported this event with a public relations and social media campaign, believing that a colourful, spring festival was exactly what people needed. Despite traffic jams that caused complaints, local businesses, hotels, and gas stations benefitted from the injection of wealth by festival goers.

The increasing interest in seeking out memorable, authentic experiences with social and cultural interactions, and the appeal of nature in an, increasingly, urban world, are additional ‘trends’ that will help Mission to be recognized as a viable tourist destination.

National and international tourism trends show that visitor motives for travel are becoming more experiential-oriented. Visitors are seeking more convenience and educational experiences.

---

7 See Appendix A – Operating Environment. Sources include: UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2015, 2014 Annual Report: Tourism as Canada’s Engine for Growth, Destination Canada; Provincial Tourism Indicators: 2015 Year-to-Date, February 2016, Destination British Columbia.
8 Source: Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Regional Profile, January 2015, Destination BC
9 abbotsfordtulipfestival.ca/ The inaugural tulip festival was held between March and May of 2016.
VISITOR TYPES
Visitor types are, primarily, leisure travellers, Free Independent Travellers (FIT), and groups via RV Caravans. A perceptions study and benchmark metrics would further the understanding of ‘why’ travelers will come to Mission. As BC tourism becomes more competitive, destinations will, increasingly, look to the execution of strong brands and development of unique product experiences to differentiate themselves and entice new visitors.

DIGITAL SHIFT
The digital shift to mobile and social media continues to increase in importance for travel planning and destination engagement. It will be critical for Tourism Mission to fully participate in the digital space to maximize opportunities in relation to generating awareness, interest, and conversion.

DBC’S CORPORATE STRATEGY
There are significant shifts related to DBC’s new corporate strategy that may include marketing opportunities for Mission, which include alignment with the DBC Supernatural brand, increased funding via Co-operative Marketing Partnerships Program, increased resources to support destination development, and support for the development of Remarkable Experiences.

2.3 TOURISM PRODUCT
Product experiences currently available in Mission and surrounding regions include:

- Fraser River.
  » Fresh-water fishing in lakes, rivers, and streams, including world-renowned sturgeon fishing on the Fraser River.

- Mountain landscape.
  » Hiking trails for all ability levels.
  » Road cycling and mountain biking.

- Backcountry.
  » Regional and provincial parks.
  » Bird and wildlife viewing.
  » Kayaking and canoeing.
  » Equestrian community (camps, riding stables, and trail rides).

- Attractions.
  » Mission Raceway.
  » Powerhouse at Stave Falls.
  » Mission Golf Course.
  » Cascade Suspension Bridge.
  » Westminster Abbey (Note: public tours are discouraged).

---

12 Source: Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Regional Profile, January 2015, Destination BC
• Lifestyle.
  » Boutique shops, spas, galleries, cafés, restaurants, and pubs.
  » Artisans and arts scene, strongly supported by the District of Mission Arts Council.13

• History.
  » Westminster Abbey.
  » Aboriginal tourism experiences.
  » Historical products that elaborate on Canada's history.

• Festivals and celebrations.

• Circle Farm Tour and the Mission Farmer’s Market.

STAVE WEST (PROPOSED TOURISM PRODUCT)

The Provincial Government, District of Mission, and Kwantlen First Nations14 have come together to help realize the tourism and recreational potential at Stave West. “All three stakeholders have a vision for Stave West – a 5,000-hectare area situated in northern Mission around the west side of Stave Lake – that would see it transformed from its current under-regulated, and often-abused state, into a family-friendly destination for outdoor recreation and tourism development.”15 This 50-square kilometer area is predicted to be one of the Lower Mainland’s most popular recreational and learning destinations with the unique opportunity to do so within the context of a sustainable forest operation.

Plans are in Stage 1. This stage includes the completion of market-driven tourism, investment and development study, establishing an outdoor learning alliance with other institutions and organizations, and funding for increased security in the area during the summer.

The Master Plan identifies potential facilities and amenities, such as16:
• camping and day-use facilities.
• motorized-use staging and training area (i.e. motorcycles, ATVs).
• equestrian camp/staging areas.
• freshwater scuba diving and training.
• fly-fishing, mountain biking, and boating.
• hiking the ‘grind’.
• 20 – 40 km multi-day backpacking loop trail.
• forest-based aerial park features (i.e. zip-lining).

13 Source: www.mission.ca/municipal-hall/departments/parks-recreation-and-culture/arts-culture/
14 The Aboriginal Tourism Association of BC has acknowledged Stave West as a “provincial demonstration project” in recognition of effective partnership development between a municipal government and local First Nations.
15 Source: www.missioncityrecord.com/news/369480912.html
16 Source: Stave West Master Plan, June 2015
TOURISM INITIATIVES

Strategic alignment with tourism partners DBC (leveraging the Supernatural brand), Aboriginal Tourism Association of BC (AtBC), Experience the Fraser (cultural and heritage corridor), Scenic 7BC marketing partnership, and regional marketing partners, such as Tourism Maple Ridge and Tourism Abbotsford, will enhance promotional and development opportunities.

Operations adjacent to Stave West include the 40-site Sayres Lake Campground, Zajac Ranch, BC Hydro Visitors Centre at Stave Falls, BC Hydro Boat Launch, immediately south of Stave West, and the Stave Falls lodge and campsite.

The proposed Tim Horton Children’s Foundation Camp holds a ‘license of occupation’ for a 60-hectare camp for children from economically disadvantaged homes. Following completion of due diligence by the foundation, successful completion of the Master Plan and core infrastructure, the foundation plans to invest $15-20 million in the construction of the facility, serving up to 3,000 children and youth annually with 5-10 full-time staff and, up to, 50 seasonal employees.\footnote{Note: The Tim Hortons camp remains in the conceptual stage and without a cemented timeline. Implementation is in Stage 1.}
2.4 VISITOR INFORMATION CENTRE (VIC)

Mission is one of the main communities located on Highway 7. Each of the participating communities is pooling funds to brand this highway as the Scenic 7BC, luring travelers off Highway 1. Current members are Hope, Agassiz-Harrison Hot Springs, Harrison Mills, Mission, Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, and Coquitlam.

Geographically, the Mission Visitor Information Centre (VIC) is poised to be the official headquarters of the Scenic 7BC corridor, in part due to the proximity to the Abbotsford International Airport and Canada/USA border crossings but, also, due to its center position along the highway. This highway receives high traffic volume and the VIC benefits from these numbers. The Mission VIC is a stand-alone Visitor Information Centre in terms of operations but requires financial support as it is subsidized by the MRCC.

Once Mission has, effectively, positioned itself in the tourism marketplace, the tools will be available to help evolve Mission into a major tourism hub in the Fraser Valley. This plan reflects the need to merge the VIC with destination marketing efforts as it will allow Mission’s tourism industry to build quickly, in the short-term, and be more sustainable in the long-term.

See below for the 2015/2016 Operating Budget. This budget does not reflect the labour invested by the MRCC labour to oversee tourism in addition to operational and building expenses. This value is estimated at $40,000.

---

CHART 1: 2015/2016 OPERATING BUDGET FOR TOURISM MISSION’S VISITOR CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Mission Contract</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Summer Student</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>3,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Host*</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consignment Sales</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Tourism Grant</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination BC Project</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>30,671</td>
<td>30,616</td>
<td>30,671</td>
<td>30,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consignment Sales Expense</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier &amp; Postage</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Production</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases for Resale</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; Maintenance — Buildings</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Expense</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Tourism project</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Profit 2015: (1,873)  Net Profit 2016: (1,993)
Information collected from Hope, Mission, Harrison Hot Springs and Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows Visitor Centres suggests visitors, travelling to the eastern end of the Scenic 7, predominantly, come from BC (44%) followed by local residents (21%), Europe (13%), and Other Canada (6%)19

![Figure 5: Market of Origin - Scenic 7BC Visitors, 2015](image)

Source: Hope, Mission, Harrison Hot Springs, Agassiz and Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows Visitor Centres, 2015

Insights from tourism operators at a Scenic 7BC workshop held on March 15, 2016, as well as additional research collected from Fraser Valley tourism businesses, suggest that the BC market represents a significantly greater percentage of visitation to the area—in fact, it is estimated to be between 75 – 80%. Using the combined Hope, Mission, and Harrison Hot Springs 2015 Visitor Centre Statistics as an indicator, the Scenic 7BC sees most same-day visitors (73%), followed by 18% staying for one day, 6% for two days, and 1% staying for four to six days (one week) or 7 – 13 days (two weeks)

![Figure 6: Trip Length - Scenic 7BC Visitors, 2015](image)

Source: Hope, Mission, Harrison Hot Springs, Agassiz and Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows Visitor Centres, 2015

19 Caution is advised as guests to visitor centres typically represent a small portion of total visitation to the area.
Top requests from visitors to the combined Hope, Mission, and Harrison Hot Springs visitor centres include site facilities, transportation, attraction/tours, investment/moving, parks, and adventure recreation.

A review of the Scenic 7BC Facebook metrics, during the summer of 2016, details that

- 62% of the followers are women and the majority (75%) are between the ages of 25-54.
- Approximately 44% are from the Scenic 7BC communities, 23% from the Fraser Valley, 21% from Metro Vancouver, and 11% from Other BC.

The MRCC has been making efforts to maintain a social media campaign despite its limited resources. The most recent highlight includes a contest that launched in July of 2016.

The 2016 Mission Tourism Contest is in FULL LAUNCH! What’s On! Mission Magazine and Tourism Mission have partnered to present the #ExploreMissionTop20 Tourism Contest!

Here is how it works: Visit the locations listed on the Top 20 list below through the months of July and August, take a picture at each location and post it to Twitter, Instagram, Facebook with #ExploreMissionTop20 or even email your photos to info@missionchamber.bc.ca. We have three categories and prizes to be won!

Prize #3 - Post photos from 5-9 different attractions & be entered into this category!

Prize #2 - Post photos from 10-15 different attractions & be entered into this category!

Prize #1 - Post photos from 16-20 different attractions & be entered to win a HUGE prize!

* Prizes will be announced throughout the summer! We live in beautiful #MissionBC, the amazing city with a huge, beautiful backyard. This summer take pride in the local attractions and beautiful places our coastal rain forest has provided us with! BE MISSION PROUD! Explore, capture memories and share! #ExploreMissionTop20
The graph below illustrates the increase in followers from June to August, approximating 60 additional followers. However with adequate resources, 60 additional Facebook followers can be earned within one week. Twitter is sitting at 756 followers.

FIGURE 8: INCREASE IN MISSION’S FACEBOOK FOLLOWERS

2.5 PARTNERSHIPS

In addition to participating in the Scenic 7BC initiative, DBC, Aboriginal Tourism Association of BC (AtBC) and community partnerships, such as the Circle Farm Tour can provide marketing support for Mission, which is further discussed under sector marketing.

DESTINATION BRITISH COLUMBIA

As an industry-led Crown Corporation, DBC works collaboratively with tourism stakeholders across the province in coordinating marketing at international, provincial, regional, and local levels. DBC has been mandated to fulfill several key marketing and leadership responsibilities critical to the long-term, sustainable growth of the provincial tourism industry. Over the next three years, DBC will be focused on three important goals, as identified in the new corporate strategy.20

- Secure the highest Net Promoter Score in North America.
- Lead Canada in growth of overnight visitor expenditures.
- Build a collaborative, insight-driven, results-focused team.

A Net Promoter Score (NPS) is a simple metric that helps organizations monitor the engagement of their customers. It reflects the likelihood that customers will recommend a product/company/place to friends, family or colleagues.

In the context of the tourism industry, NPS is based on responses to the question, “How likely are you to recommend [British Columbia] as a travel destination to a friend, family member, or colleague?”

---

20 Destination BC Corporate Strategy: www.destinationbc.ca/cmspages/getfile.aspx?guid=55651809-3ab6-4f0e-ba36-9bfb8de7ef9
Responses are scored from 0 = “not at all likely” to 10 = “extremely likely”, and respondents are divided into three categories:

- **Detractors (scores of 0 to 6):** Unhappy visitors, unlikely to tell others to visit and might even damage the reputation of a destination through negative word-of-mouth.
- **Passives (scores of 7 or 8):** Marginally satisfied visitors not excited enough to tell others about their travel experience.
- **Promoters (scores of 9 or 10):** Loyal enthusiasts likely to return and rave about their travel experience.

NPS is calculated by subtracting the percentage of detractors from the percentage of promoters.

In addition, the corporate strategy identifies five iconic experiences that showcase BC in a compelling way: Canadian Rockies, Rainforests, Cities in Wilderness, Ocean Coast, and Skiing.

**Mission is a city in the wilderness.**

Key DBC initiatives that may impact Mission include the launch of:

- BC’s new tourism brand creative and guidelines. There is significant effort being placed on industry leveraging and amplifying the BC destination brand with the tagline Super, Natural British Columbia.  

- A new application-based provincial Co-operative Marketing Partnerships Program, which replaces the current Tourism Partners, Community Tourism Opportunities, and Experiences BC. The new program is an application-based program of which Mission can apply directly to Destination BC for funding on approved marketing activities, once forming a consortium. A consortium is a partnership between two or more communities. Recommended partners include Maple Ridge and Harrison Mills due to proximity and similar tourism products/services.

- Explorer Quotient® (EQ) program. EQ is a proprietary market segmentation system based on traveller psychological characteristics, such as their attitudes, beliefs, values, motivations, and behaviours. When various psychological characteristics are combined, different types of travellers emerge. These are known as Explorer Types. DBC is targeting three primary Explorer Types: Authentic Experiencers, Cultural Explorers, and Free Spirits.

**Mission has tourism products that will be attractive to authentic experiencers, cultural explorers, and free spirits.**

- The Remarkable Experiences pilot program is designed to support businesses over a period of time with the objectives of improving their digital and social media marketing skills, increasing their NPS, and enhancing the visitor experience, but also the collective experiences between the businesses.

- New marketing strategies with a focus on Captivate, Advocate, and Generate:
  
  » Captivate: Create an emotional connection with BC in the minds of global consumers. This strategy will drive visitation by fostering an emotional connection between the target audience and BC through alignment with the BC destination brand, inspirational storytelling to passionate audiences, and data-driven marketing.

---

23 Learn more at: [www.destinationbc.ca/Resources/Explorer-Quotient.aspx#VOmrCT7F_So](http://www.destinationbc.ca/Resources/Explorer-Quotient.aspx#VOmrCT7F_So). Register with Destination BC: [tourismresearch@DestinationBC.ca](mailto:tourismresearch@DestinationBC.ca)
» Advocate: Amplify traveller advocacy about BC. This strategy will drive visitation by amplifying the power of peer-to-peer recommendations to influence potential travellers to visit BC, thereby increasing reach and impact.

» Generate: Lead generation for BC tourism businesses and travel trade. This strategy will increase referrals for tourism business in BC by leveraging the strength of global relationships and technological capabilities.

• A strong focus on destination development and planning.

ABORIGINAL TOURISM ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

The Aboriginal Tourism Association of British Columbia (AtBC) is a non-profit, stakeholder-based organization that is committed to growing and promoting a sustainable, culturally-rich Aboriginal tourism industry. AtBC works closely with tourism, business, education, and government organizations to help BC’s Aboriginal tourism businesses offer quality experiences and actively promotes these experiences to visitors and local residents.25

In 2013, AtBC unveiled its 5-year Next Phase 2012-17 strategy. AtBC’s five-year strategic targets are to increase:

• revenue to $68 million (10% growth per year).
• employment (at 4,000 full-time equivalent and averaging 10% growth per year).
• the number of market-ready Aboriginal cultural tourism businesses to 100 (10% growth per year in every region).

Key five-year strategies include: Push for Market-Readiness, Build and Strengthen Partnerships, Focus on Online Marketing, Focus on Key and Emerging Markets, Focus on Authenticity and Quality Assurance, and Regional Approach.

Mission’s Aboriginal businesses may qualify to become an AtBC member and benefit from these marketing strategies.

2.6 MARKETING EFFORTS

To date, marketing efforts have been put towards:

• a tourism-focused website www.tourismmission.info
  » development of the #ExploreMission app, which will be added to the website.
• social media efforts on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and Trip Advisor. Trip Advisor reviews sit at 2,857 covering accommodations, vacation rentals, restaurants, and attractions.
• DBC’s Social Media Visitor Program26
• creation of Stan the Sturgeon (an icon that takes on the current brand’s personality and used to engage with residents and visitors). Similar examples are the Sasquatch in Harrison Hot Springs and the squirrel in Banff.
• attending Scenic 7BC meetings and supporting the collaboration.
• engaging visitors who stop at the Mission Visitor Services Centre.
• industry networking, often involving representation at DBC events.
• Hello BC profile on DBC’s Hello BC website. (See below)

25  www.aboriginalbc.com/about

26  As part of DBC’s corporate strategy, Destination is working with the Visitor Services Network and the entire tourism industry to expand the delivery of visitor services by creating more contemporary and innovative approaches to serving guests’ information needs as they travel throughout the province. DBC is working with communities to evolve visitor services to incorporate forward-thinking online, mobile and crowd-sourcing channels, alongside traditional visitor centres, as appropriate to each community.  www.destinationbc.ca/Programs/Visitor-Centre-Network.aspx
Through the Tourism Advisory Committee, the MRCC has helped to lead current marketing tactics. However, due to a lack of adequate funding and resources the website is not branded nor user-friendly, lacks updated information, and the social media channels are not steadily active. Branding confusion exists as Stan the Sturgeon seems disconnected in visitor’s eyes as more time is needed to launch this character. The intentions are solid and have great potential, and it is understood that the MRCC is working within limited means and subsidizing these efforts wherever possible.
2.7 COMPETITOR REVIEW

Identified consortium competitors include the Fraser Valley portion of Highway 1 and the Sea-to-Sky Highway. Both represent alternate road trips/day trips within close proximity to the Metro Vancouver and Fraser Valley markets.

FRASER VALLEY (HIGHWAY 1)

Highway 1, known as the Trans-Canada Highway, may provide a quicker route to Scenic 7BC communities from Metro Vancouver and Fraser Valley target markets (dependent on location, destination, day or week and time-of-day). The Fraser Valley portion (Chilliwack, Abbotsford, and Langley) work together as a consortium to market their experiences. The main selling propositions are:

- agri-tourism and farm-fresh food.
- outdoor adventures.
- wineries and craft breweries.

The Fraser Valley consortium has various products listed on their website\(^\text{27}\) that fall into these categories as well as an experience guide in print and online. Resources have also been allocated towards campaigns, such as ‘Engage the Senses’, which highlights tourism businesses that excel in beauty (sight), cuisine (taste & smell), culture and music (hearing), and touch, ranging from soft farm animals to high thread-count linens in hotel suites. The campaign has versatility and can be applied in many ways.

SEA TO SKY (HIGHWAY 99)

The Sea to Sky Highway travels from Vancouver to Whistler. As the name describes, it is a scenic drive, and only takes two hours to travel from Vancouver to Whistler. It is a more developed end destination getaway and beautiful, along the ocean-side, than what is currently offered enroute to Mission. The Tourism Whistler website promotes this highway as “a beautiful, mountain highway drive to start your adventure”. Tourism Vancouver also promotes this highway with weekend travel itineraries.

Marketing efforts for the Sea to Sky Highway highlight many stops along the way including Horseshoe Bay, Lions Bay, Britannia Beach, Squamish, Garibaldi Provincial Park, Whistler, and Pemberton. Each of these destinations has its own unique selling proposition, but one common element is the natural beauty as each stop includes nature and leisure products.

This route also has cultural history attached to it. It is/was, a well-travelled, ancient trade route of the Aboriginal Peoples. To recognize this, traditional cedar-hat-topped visitor information pavilions are posted at scenic overlooks. The newest attraction is the Squamish Lil’wat Cultural Centre, which opened shortly before the 2010 Winter Olympic and Paralympics. Visitors and locals can learn about the history of the area and, more specifically, more about the Coast Salish people.

\(^{27}\) Website: www.thefraservalley.ca
2.8 MISSION’S STRENGTHS AND ASSETS

LOCATION

• nestled on a southern coastal mountain slope, overlooks the lush Fraser Valley and the mighty Fraser River, and surrounded by mountain vistas and natural forest settings.

• close to two international airports (Abbotsford International Airport is 30 minutes away and the Vancouver International Airport is one hour away).

• on the Scenic 7BC Highway28, between Maple Ridge and Harrison Mills/Harrison Hot Springs29, which has received matched-funding marketing dollars30 to drive traffic down this route as an alternative to Highway 1. Ten minutes away from Abbotsford, Mission’s sister city.

• Visitor Services Office is in a highly visible location on Hwy 7, where traffic comes from all directions.

• Located within the Vancouver Coast and Mountains region where over half of BC’s businesses are located.

• close to urban markets with large populations and a concentrated number of tourists from across the world.
  » 20-minute drive from the US border.
  » 70 kilometres east/southeast of Vancouver.
    • one of the world’s largest and most culturally-diverse tourist markets31
    • more than 9.3 million people visited Vancouver in 2015 — the highest overnight visitation in the city’s history.32
    • Vancouver’s top five visitor markets are Canada, the U.S., China, UK and Australia (in order of volume).
    • 2.5 million people reside in Metro Vancouver

28 Scenic 7BC is Highway 7 or Lougheed Highway.
29 Renowned resort municipality of Harrison Hot Springs and Harrison Mills is home to the world’s largest eagle winter gathering.
30 A consortium of seven partners have collaborated to market the highway, as a preferred alternative to Highway 1, and have been approved for funds
31 Tourism contributes approximately $6.1 billion to the Metro Vancouver economy, annually, and provides over 66,000 full time jobs. Source: 2013 numbers based on actual
32 www.tourismvancouver.com/media/corporate-communications/vancouvers-tourism-industry-fast-facts
HISTORY
• founded in the late 1800s, Mission was, originally, inhabited by the Stó:lo First Nations People.
  » place of ‘firsts’. Site of Canada’s first train robbery and B.C.’s first rail link to the United States.
  » home to one of the earliest hydroelectric dams and Fraser River bridges
  » home to the oldest known First Nations’ archaeological site in BC.

NATURE AND RECREATION
• Stave West development.
• fishing (sturgeon and salmon) and outdoor recreational sports.
• Extensive trail system enhancing mountain biking, running, hiking, and photography.
• 12% of BC’s tourism revenue can be attributed to nature-based tourism and continues to increase.
• Cascade Suspension Bridge and Falls.
• Dewdney Trunk Rd.
• Exclusivity with motorized usage area.

ARTS & CULTURE
• downtown core with galleries, and artisan shops.

WELCOMING PERSONALITY
• small-town; charming community with big vision and potential.

BRANDING
• potential brand assets and positioning could align with DBC’s supernatural brand.

GOVERNANCE
• has an active Tourism Advisory Committee and municipal support for tourism.

Mission is a tourism destination that is strongly poised for growth and high traffic volume.
2.9 WEAKNESSES, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES

WEAKNESSES & CHALLENGES

• Lack of hotels and conference centres.
• Air BnBs are on the rise.
• Current tourist is price sensitive and unaware of tourism experiences.
• Lack of online presence with no ‘calls to action’.

OPPORTUNITIES

• Event development and a sport tourism plan.
  » Requires District support to build sport facilities.
• Revitalize old to create new.
  » Downtown area (mural campaign encourages photo opportunities that are shared by family and friends offline and online, primarily via social media) Requires District support.
• Target the RV market
  » Given the increasing number of European travelers coming to BC, and the Scenic 7BC promotional plan, which targets this segment, RV markets are expected to increase. The Mission VIC can tap into this market very easily and redirect traffic to Mission’s parks and backyard. The Stave Lake Master proposal is an excellent example of how Mission can capitalize on this market.
• Increase capture ratio of drive-by traffic, down Scenic 7BC, by encouraging travellers to stop and ‘eat, see, play, and stay’.
• Increase community awareness to raise morale within the community.
• Earn buy-in from the hotel owners and create infrastructure to collect tourism revenue from Hotel Room Tax (MRDT) to earn up to $100,000, which is collected by looking at current occupancy rates with an anticipated increase33. See the chart below, which provides hotel tax revenue at current occupancy rates.
• Lobby that District charge a flat tourism tax to Air BnBs, to help support hotels once MRDT is implemented.
• Marketing support from Destination BC, AtBC, and other sector partners and alliances.

CHART 2: ESTIMATED MRDT COLLECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Tax Rate (%)</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Days in a Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Western</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>$38,544.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Head</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>$8,409.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at 2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46,953.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Western</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>$57,816.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Head</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>$12,614.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,430.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 Given the amount of hotel rooms at this time in Mission, MRDT is estimated at no more than $100k per year.
**CHART 3: COMPETITOR ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>DMO STATUS</th>
<th>DMO NAME</th>
<th>BRANDING FOCUS</th>
<th>MARKETING CAMPAIGNS</th>
<th>CONTEXT FOR BRANDING</th>
<th>TAGLINE</th>
<th>HASHTAG</th>
<th>BUSINESS CYCLE POSITIONING</th>
<th>HOTEL TAX RATE AS OF 2017</th>
<th>2015 HOTEL TAX REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Advantage Hope</td>
<td>(1) Fix and Fuel (2) Relax and Sleep (3) Outdoor Adventure and Biking</td>
<td>Scenic 7BC, Hope Cascades and Canyons</td>
<td>Drawing on the natural surroundings</td>
<td>Embrace the Journey</td>
<td>#embracehopebc</td>
<td>Growth/Expansion Stage</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGASSIZ &amp; HARRISON HOT SPRINGS/ MILLS</td>
<td>Established and a resort municipality</td>
<td>Tourism Harrison and Tourism Harrison Mills</td>
<td>(1) Hike, bike, paddle (2) Circle Farm Tour/Slow Food Tour (3) Eagles and Salmon (4) Squatch (5) Festivals and Events</td>
<td>Scenic 7BC, Bald Eagle Viewing, and Circle Farm Tour,</td>
<td>Drawing on the natural surroundings and wildlife phenomena; organizing summer events on the lake and off-season events, such as the Wine Festival and Oktoberfest</td>
<td>Just Up the Road and It’s In Our Nature</td>
<td>#justuptheroad #itsinournature</td>
<td>Injecting growth into the contraction stage</td>
<td>3% (discussion in process to include Harrison Mills)</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Process</td>
<td>#exploremission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDGE-MEADOWS</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Process</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>#exploremapleridge</td>
<td>Introductory</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILLIWACK</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Tourism Chilliwack</td>
<td>(1) Nature (2) Circle Farm Tour (3) Engage the Senses (4) Arts Culture &amp; History (5) Outdoor Adventure (6) Sport Tourism</td>
<td>The Fraser Valley, Engage the Senses, Cultus Lake BC, and Circle Farm Tour</td>
<td>Drawing on the natural surroundings and millennials moving to the area supporting farm-to-plate, microbreweries and exploring the outdoors</td>
<td>See What Nature is Hiding</td>
<td>#sharechilliwack</td>
<td>Growth/Expansion Stage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTSFORD</td>
<td>Established and finalizing the next 5-year strategic planning process</td>
<td>Tourism Abbotsford</td>
<td>(1) Circle Farm Tour (2) Engage the Senses (3) Sport Tourism (4) Wineries and Breweries</td>
<td>The Fraser Valley, Engage the Senses, Fresh Faces</td>
<td>Drawing on the agricultural land, natural beauty, farm-to-plate, and profiling community champions that are revitalizing the community</td>
<td>City in the Country</td>
<td>#exploresabbotsford</td>
<td>Injecting growth into the contraction stage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLEY</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Tourism Langley</td>
<td>(1) Rural and urban experiences ranging from agri-tourism, farm-to-plate and wineries to eclectic hubs (2) Engage the Senses (3) Sport Tourism (4) Festivals and Events</td>
<td>The Fraser Valley, Engage the Senses, Endless Choices</td>
<td>Drawing on the sub-branded regions, such as the wineries and Circle Farm stops</td>
<td>#langleylife</td>
<td>Recession/Contraction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Township of Langley is considering the formation of a separate DMO)
3.0 TOURISM MISSION’S MARKETING PLAN

In the preparation of the tourism marketing plan, the following principles are kept in mind:

• **Visitor Needs**: BC communities must be responsive to visitor needs, requiring an understanding of what these are, and then developing tourism experiences to meet these expectations.

• **Inclusiveness**: Consultation and collaboration form the basis of plan development.

• **Effective Partnerships**: Tourism is a fragmented industry. Effective partnerships among tourism operators, communities, DMOs, and all levels of government are essential to building a cohesive, strong, and sustainable tourism industry.

• **Sustainability**: Tourism is being developed in a sustainable manner, recognizing the need for economic, social, and environmental sustainability.

• **Community Support**: To be successful, tourism development needs buy-in, requiring support by the community as a whole — businesses, local government, and residents.

This section is the embodiment of the vision, mission, and goals, serving as a roadmap for the future. Please note that this section is an exercise of what the vision, mission, and branding strategy could look like but is not the official brand. A formal branding process must be implemented by an experienced and qualified contractor or agency at a later date. See Funding and Timeline sections.

3.1 VISION

To become a sustainable year-round tourism destination. This will be accomplished by delivering authentic experiences that promote our region’s cultural and natural features.

3.2 MISSION

Promote Mission as a tourism destination to increase the number of visitors coming for a day-trip and overnight visits. Facilitate tourism development by collaborating with stakeholders and industry partners, empower residents to be brand ambassadors, educate stakeholders about tourism opportunities, and encourage improvements in tourism amenities.
3.3 MARKETS

PRIMARY
- Fraser Valley
- Metro Vancouver

SECONDARY
- Pacific Northwest.
- Okanagan
- Vancouver Island
- Southern Alberta
- Sport tourism organizers, influencers and media

Key activities, which motivate trips to the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains tourism region are arts and cultural activities, sightseeing, nature, wildlife viewing, visiting parks and lakes, and friends or relatives.

Visitor types for Mission are leisure travellers, Free Independent Travellers (FIT), and groups via RV Caravans.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

National and international tourism trends show that visitor markets and the industry continue to change. Visitor motivations for travel are becoming far more experiential-oriented. Experiential travel is also known as immersion travel and experiential education. It is a form of travel in which people focus on experiencing a country, city or place by connecting to its history, people, and culture. This is why Destination BC’s brand is founded on sharing our province’s cultural history and creating emotional connections with travelers. Visitors want to be immersed in experiences.

34 Destination Supernatural branding video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dNIrZNjzJnQ
FIGURES 11 & 12: SCREENSHOTS FROM DESTINATION BC’S BRANDING VIDEOS
3.4 KEY TOURISM PRODUCTS AND FEATURES

- Nature-based outdoor activities, including planned development of Stave Lake.
- Fraser River Heritage Park.
- Fraser River-focused outdoor activities with an emphasis on guided fishing and soft adventure activities.
- Extensive trail system that enhances mountain biking, running, hiking, and photography.
- Feature outdoor attractions, such as Cascade Falls and the suspension bridge.
- Heritage, arts, and cultural attractions, including Aboriginal cultural attractions.
- Signature festivals and events.
- Mission Raceway.

3.5 OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

General objectives are to:

- promote Mission as an attractive tourist destination and increase tourism awareness.
- encourage tourism development and implement sustainable tourism strategies.
- provide assistance to tourism projects and business that are in line with the direction of this plan.
- diversify Mission’s tourism product by encouraging experiential tourism.
- grow visitation to increase overnight stays during the shoulder season of September to June.
- Increase partnerships with communities in the Fraser Valley and along the Scenic7BC.

It is predicted that visitor traffic will increase by:

- 5% in 2017-2018 for daytrips and 2% for overnight stays.
- 10% in 2018-2019 for daytrips and 5% for overnight stays.
- 10-12% in 2019-2020 for daytrips and overnight stays.

This objective reflects an anticipated ability to accommodate more overnight guests as the quality and quantity of tourism products increase, and increased funding for Tourism Mission, via the implementation of MRDT as well as other sources, begins. (See Section 4.0)

To achieve these growth rates, Tourism Mission will need a sufficient operating budget, requiring district support until the DMO can stand alone.

To measure this growth, indicators must be used and analytics must be measured.

- Taking count of daily Visitor Service visitors and detailing the nature of their inquiries.
- Website tracking that measures traffic and conversion in addition to trackable phone numbers.
- Social media engagement.
- Hotel occupancy rates and room revenue.
3.6 BRANDING

3.6.1 Brand Identity and Personality

The first step in a successful promotional strategy is creating an identifiable and recognizable brand identity. This is accomplished through the creation of the Brand Identity pyramid in which the personality of the brand is established to set the 'look and feel' of the promotional campaign.

A successful promotional strategy must include a ‘memorable experience’. This refers to the creative aspects of the brand or campaign that will cut through other promotional clutter and help the target audience care, remember, and talk about the brand to others. It’s the story that is created and helps to reinforce the benefits or rewards of interacting with this brand. It is carried through all elements of the marketing materials.

The promotional strategy will outline tactics to raise visitor awareness as a means of creating demand. Once the brand is differentiated from ‘competing’ destination brands, it is necessary to remind visitors of the benefits of Mission’s product and to reinforce the brand, as a means, to create repeat visits.

The brand pyramid enables organizations to understand who they are from a consumer point of view. The objective is to develop a character that is based on the perceived elements and to help consumers form a relationship with this brand. This exercise sets the tone, look, and feel of the visual and written elements, plus it is the basis of all materials and promotional campaigns moving forward.

---

**FIGURE 13: BRAND PYRAMID**

![Brand Pyramid Diagram](image)
PERSONALITY

Personality is the embodiment of the brand. If this brand was a real person, “What would they be like or who would they be like?” This is the main component of differentiation in an industry and helps establish look, voice, and tone of the marketing materials. The personality is what helps attract the target audience and keeps them engaged over time. The personality does not change for many years and must be consistent in all facets of the organization, especially hiring decisions.

- The way in which a destination presents itself through words, images and emotive invitations can be the difference between being known or passed by.
- It’s about uniting forward-thinking with a brand personality that is inviting and competitively positioned against other destination brands.
- A clear set of meaningful tourism objectives and aspirations lie behind a brand’s unique features. Through its presence, the brand showcases the destination to the world far beyond simply slogans and symbols, developing a desired connection with target audiences.

As mentioned, a formal branding strategy must be created upon implementation of this plan, but a mock-up of what the brand could look like has been presented below. The visuals could also be a campaign idea. It was created based on feedback and the identity that, organically, emerged during the stakeholder sessions. The campaign idea illustrates how the community of Mission and visitors would perceive Mission, as a warm community with something to offer everyone. By ‘making it your mission’, with a play on the word ‘mission’, residents decide what that means to them and visitors feel embraced by a community offering multiple authentic and cultural experiences, mainly rooted in nature-based activities.

—

FIGURE 14: STORYBOARD TREATMENT, TAGLINE AND LOGO APPLIED TO SIGNAGE, A WEBSITE MOCK-UP AND SOCIAL MEDIA CHANNELS
MISSION CANNOT BE DEFINED BY JUST ONE THING. IT OFFERS SOMETHING FOR EVERYONE. WHICH IS WHY WE INVITE YOU TO.

MAKE IT YOUR MISSION
3.6.2 Messaging

Some of the words used to describe Mission are:

- Beautiful.
- Natural and adventurous.
- Scenic.
- Leisurely.
- Peaceful.
- Family-oriented, quaint, and warm.
- Historical.
- Off the beaten path.
- Cultural.
- Arts-oriented.
- Funky.

CONSUMER END BENEFIT

In collaboration with the Scenic 7BC Initiative, the consumer end benefit includes a state of relaxation from taking the scenic, slower route. Visitors will explore and discover along Highway 7, as encouraged by Tourism Vancouver on the Sea to Sky Highway, and experience beauty and ‘road trip’ fun. Once they arrive in Mission, they can embrace the charm of a community that has so much to offer.

Supporting Messages:

- Let the freedom of exploring lift your spirits.
- Picturesque scenery of wildlife, mountains, rolling foothills, forest, and the Fraser River.
- Genuine and generous locals that welcome you into their backyard.
- Connect to the history and local cultures that have shaped the community.
- It’s the Mission you didn’t know.
- Make it your Mission to...
3.6.3 Brand Positioning

FIGURE 15: PERCEPTUAL BRAND POSITIONING CHART

- Soft adventure and Eco-tourism
- Culture and Arts
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RIDGE-MEADOWS
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MISSION

CHILLIWACK

LANGLEY

ABBOTSFORD
3.6.4 Marketing Tactics

This section outlines priority initiatives to support the identified goals. It is not meant to be a comprehensive list of all activities, but highlights the strategic priorities for the next 12-18 months.

• Build a brand
  » Complete a branding strategy and platform, including brand positioning, brand story/platform, visual branding, brand guidelines, industry usage, etc.
  » Tie the messaging and visual assets to the Iconic Experiences identified within the DBC Corporate Strategy — Cities in Wilderness.
  » Work with tourism businesses and partners to ensure their marketing efforts reflect the Tourism Mission brand and DBC’s tourism brand. Ensure all stakeholders are knowledgeable with respect to the brand platform and have the tools and guidelines required.

• Content creation: photography (lifestyle and nature shots) and videography with B-roll.
  » Look at content being gathered by DBC that can be used. [www.imagebank.destinationbc.net](http://www.imagebank.destinationbc.net)

• Develop a highly functional and visual website centered around ‘eat, play, stay, do’.
  » Responsive platform that is well optimized.
  » Interactive map.
  » Events calendar.
  » Optimized for Internet searchability (Search Engine Marketing).
  » Itineraries that suit the current and target market travelers.
    • Nature and Outdoor Recreation.
      » Includes parks, hiking trails, wildlife viewing, fishing, etc.
    • Culinary.
      » Includes unique places to eat and drink.
    • Cultural.
      » Includes cultural and historical highlights, as well as the colourful ‘must see’ places. City of ‘firsts’.
    • Festivals & Events.
      » Showcase the iconic and unique. Creates a significant draw, compelling visitors to visit during the off season.

• Public Relations Campaign.
  » Influencer and media engagement. Brand ambassadors. DBC support with media relations campaigns by bringing travelers to the area and funding individual and group familiarization trips.
  » Social media engagement to lure new travelers and create dialogue.
    • Creative (cover photos, timeline images, carousel ads).
    • Budget for sponsored content and targeted posts.
    • Mural campaign to support Instagram picture sharing.
• Digital marketing.
  » Google listing.
  » Trip Advisor page to be optimized and enhanced by offering special features and responding to reviews.
  » Create a Youtube account, to share video clips, and ensure that all social media accounts are consistent with branding and messaging. Requires sponsored content and targeted post budget.
  » Google Analytics tracking for the website.
  » Google Adwords — targeting and retargeting (Search Engine Marketing).
• Database marketing: leverage existing partners marketing efforts, databases, newsletters and e-blasts.
• Pay-to-Play marketing campaigns centred around Mission’s strengths (i.e. self-guided historical maps, Did You Know, Backyard Adventure etc).
• Execute promotional materials and messaging through the Visitor Centre.
• Highlight packaged offerings throughout marketing communications and channels, including the Travel Deals section on HelloBC.com.
• Destination BC e-newsletter – work with Destination BC to incorporate Mission as a featured story in their consumer newsletter.
• Create and execute an event marketing plan.
• Cooperative marketing opportunities, such as Scenic 7BC.
• Leverage sector marketing organizations activities to feature Mission. Identified sectors include:
  » BC Golf Marketing Alliance.
  » Mountain Bike Tourism Association.
  » North to Alaska (Drive market, RV and FIT).
  » Fishing sector marketing organizations, e.g., BC Fishing Resorts and Outfitters Association, Sport Fishing Institute.
  » BC Ale Trail (new for 2016).
  » BC RV and Campground Association.
  » Work with DBC to ensure that Mission is represented in Touring & Exploring marketing initiatives for the region.

3.6.5 Measurement
• Work with Destination BC to implement Net Promoter Score tracking.
  » Measure the impact of promotional campaigns and utilize marketing tactics, such as dedicated landing pages and analytics as tracking tools.
  » Implement visitor data collection through visitor surveys.
  » Collect analytics for the website and social media.
• Work with tourism businesses to instill a culture of tracking and reporting on business performance, which includes monitoring the following performance measurements. An increase in:
  » overnight visitation and length of stay.
  » accommodation revenue.
  » awareness, interest, and conversion from target markets.
  » Net Promoter Score.
  » employment.
4.0 FUNDING

Significant funding increases will be required for Mission, not only to achieve its tourism objectives, but to compete with more established destinations in BC. A minimum annual budget of approximately $360K (including staffing and the operation of the Visitor Centre) is required to achieve the objectives set out in this plan and to implement the strategies and tactics. It is recognized that Mission will need to reach the $360K budget level in Year 4 and it would need to start at the $215K level in Year 1. Note: suggestions for the District of Mission include subsidizing its investment via various sources, such as the Renewed Gas Tax Agreement made available through the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM)\textsuperscript{35}. Eligible project categories have been expanded to public transit, local roads and bridges, community energy systems, drinking water, wastewater, solid waste, disaster mitigation, recreational infrastructure, cultural infrastructure, tourism infrastructure, sport infrastructure, local and regional airports, short-line rail, short-sea shipping, broadband connectivity, highways, brownfield redevelopment, and capacity building.

Other ideas include business permit fees/levies for vacation rentals and Air BnBs in addition to MRDT collection.

**CHART 4: ANNUAL BUDGET FOR YEAR 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DMO Funding by District Mission</td>
<td>$190K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DBC &amp; Partner Funding</td>
<td>$25K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

- Tourism Mission is established.
- MRCC continues to collect the Municipal Fee-For-Service (MFFS), from the District of Mission, to operator Visitor Services. The MFFS is currently $20K, but is not included in the Year 1 Budget. With its inclusion, budget rests at $235K.
- Budget will be used primarily for DMO start-up costs, branding, marketing asset development, labour, and project management wages. Therefore, limited budget is available for promotional activities including matched funding involving DBC in the first year only.
- DBC & Partner Funding consists of revenue received from Scenic 7BC partners and DBC for collaborative marketing initiatives.

\textsuperscript{35} Source: www.ubcm.ca Tourism Langley was given start-up funds from this tax via UBCM.

\textsuperscript{36} Examples include funding for Scenic 7BC overseen by Tourism Mission as opposed to Hope, Cascades and Canyons.
CHART 5: ANNUAL BUDGET FOR YEAR 2

YEAR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMO Funding by District Mission $37</td>
<td>$120K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFFS to operate Visitor Services from the District of Mission</td>
<td>$70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Visitor Centre Network (BCVC) funding</td>
<td>$12K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Programs</td>
<td>$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBC &amp; Partner Funding</td>
<td>$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-to-Play Programs</td>
<td>$5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

- District of Mission funding decreases every year.
- MFFS is collected by Tourism Mission to operate Visitor Services and increases to $70K. The reason is that the MRCC is currently subsidizing the MFFS, which is not sustainable.
- BCVC funding is currently collected by the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce. Last year, $12K was received. In Year 2, Tourism Mission receives the BCVC funding directly.
- Retail programs include local products that will appeal to tourists, including Aboriginal artwork. However, we recommend focusing on branded clothing and Stan the Sturgeon stuffed animals.
- The DMO will utilize the Visitor Centre to increase other revenue sources through retail and pay-to-pay programs.
- Provincial grants are available for tourism development, arts and culture etc. Grant applications fall under the Executive Director’s job requirements and should align with the community brand identity and organizational goals.
- DBC & Partner Funding is estimated to increase by 50K as the Scenic 7BC campaign gains momentum.
- Pay-to-play programs will need to be developed by the Executive Director and project managers.

---

37 It is important to note that the District can create different revenue streams. Examples include: a flat additional license fee to Air BnBs, B&Bs under four rooms, vacation rentals. Hoteliers need to sense a fairness with tax collection to support MRDT implementation. It should also be noted that DBC is working on regulating the rise of Air BnBs and we do not know what the situation will be at the end of Year 3.

38 Recommendations include themed guides: Arts and Culture, Land and Water Adventure, World-Class Fishing, Mission… the Untold Story
**CHART 6: ANNUAL BUDGET FOR YEAR 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMO Funding by District of Mission</td>
<td>$90K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFFS to operate Visitor Services</td>
<td>$70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCVC Funding</td>
<td>$12K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Programs</td>
<td>$36K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-to-Play Programs</td>
<td>$16K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants39</td>
<td>$13K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBC &amp; Partner funding</td>
<td>$85K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$320K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

- Once the DMO is showing significant results, MRDT implementation will begin with funds collected as of January 1st 2020, which is Year 4. Year 3’s budget will be highly focused on this goal as detailed in Section 6.

- MFFS remains constant.

- BCVC funding is currently collected by the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce. Tourism Mission receives the BCVC funding directly.

- Retail programs increase as product lines develop.

- Provincial grants are available for tourism development, arts and culture etc. Grant applications fall under the Executive Director’s job requirements and should align with the community brand identity and organizational goals.

- DBC & Partner Funding increases slightly.

- Successful pay-to-play programs will continue and new programs can be developed.

---

39 This is an estimation and should build on Year 2.
As the end of Year 4, based on MRDT implementation, funding by the District of Mission will be minimal and MRDT is estimated at a maximum of $50-60K. This is evident in Chart 2 and the predicted increase of overnight stays stated in Section 3.6. Should the District of Mission cease to provide funding after Year 4, Tourism Mission can financially operate as a stand-alone DMO.\(^4^0\) This tourism plan must be re-evaluated and updated at the end of Year 3.

For a detailed budget breakdown, See Appendix D.

---

\(^{40}\) Tourism Abbotsford does not receive funding from the City of Abbotsford but Tourism Chilliwack does.
### 4.1 SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES

As the DMO develops there will be differences on how the budgets are spent from year-to-year. In the first year, focus is required on developing the DMO. As each year progresses, the priorities will change. The following charts are examples of how the budget might look moving forward.

**CHART 8: ANNUAL EXPENDITURES FOR YEAR 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>$83K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Equipment / Supplies</td>
<td>$21K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$1K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$4K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Assets</td>
<td>$35K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Communication</td>
<td>$26K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>$4K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>5k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHART 9: ANNUAL EXPENDITURES FOR YEAR 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>$124K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Equipment / Supplies</td>
<td>$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$32K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Assets</td>
<td>$13K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>$64K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>$8K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$24K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>6k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$305K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 10: Annual Expenditures for Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>137K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Equipment / Supplies</td>
<td>9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>29K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Assets</td>
<td>9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>79K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>25K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>6k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>322K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 11: Annual Expenditures for Year 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>147K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Equipment / Supplies</td>
<td>9K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>33K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Assets</td>
<td>17K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>112K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Memberships</td>
<td>6k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>360K</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 REGIONAL TOURISM MARKET COMPETITIVE OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT

ABBOTSFORD

The Tourism Abbotsford Society is a DMO, which owns and operates the Abbotsford Visitor Information Centre, develops and delivers an annual destination sales and marketing plan and manages the operation of the Fraser Valley Trade & Exhibition Centre — TRADEX — which is owned by the City of Abbotsford.

The Tourism Abbotsford Society receives the Municipal Hotel Room Tax (MHRT) averaging approximately $250,000 annually, which is re-invested in tourism marketing activities. Other funding sources include retail sales from the Visitor Centre, a $70,000 fee-for-service from the City of Abbotsford, plus funding through DBC for the Visitor Centre ($18,750) as well as co-operative marketing programs with The Fraser Valley Group, Regional Circle Farm Tour, and West Coast Food.

Expenses include annual payments to the City of Abbotsford of $100,000 for administration support (payroll, accounting and IT) for both the Tradex and Visitor Centre and $95,000 to a controlled Tradex operating capital fund.

*The overall annual budget for tourism staffing and related activities (excluding the TRADEX) is approximately $500,000.*

CHILLIWACK

Tourism Chilliwack is incorporated with the City of Chilliwack as its sole shareholder, operating a non-traditional DMO, with a business function that conforms to governance policies and strategic planning. It operates with a private board, which includes three non-voting members who are city representatives and a Cultus Lake Park Board appointee. The DMO operates a Visitor Centre, the Chilliwack Heritage Park, and owns a Flag Shop Franchise.

Tourism Chilliwack collects the MHRT and receives fee-for-service for operation of the Visitor Centre, development and implementation of Chilliwack’s destination marketing plan, and for the operation of Chilliwack Heritage Park. Tourism Chilliwack gains additional funding through DBC co-operative marketing programs for the Fraser Valley Group, Regional Circle Farm Tour, and West Coast Food marketing campaigns and earns a profit from the Flag Shop franchise and Visitor Centre retail sales.

*The overall annual budget for Tourism Chilliwack (including Heritage Park) is $1,435,341.*

HARRISON HOT SPRINGS

Tourism Harrison operates a DMO, with a stand-alone Board comprised of seven members, five hotel representatives, a Chamber of Commerce representative and a Municipal representative. The board is independent from the municipality and is not directly connected to any other agency, but does work closely with the Agassiz-Harrison Chamber of Commerce.

Tourism Harrison receives a $30,000 fee-for-service for the Visitor Centre and $10,000 to fund tourism-based events (i.e. Harrison Beer Festival), which also generates yearly revenue of approximately $50,000. It collects the MHRT, which makes $300,000 – $350,000 annually, and obtains funding through the DBC Co-operative Marketing Program on Scenic 7BC and Regional Circle Farm Tour.

*Total Annual Budget is approximately $450,000.*
HOPE

Hope has utilized its economic development asset to primarily focus on tourism development through AdvantageHOPE, a not-for-profit society that is funded by the District of Hope, and governed by an appointed Board of Directors, to deliver both economic development and tourism services. It operates a joint VIC and museum and, through the District of Hope, has recently committed to revitalizing Station House, a historic building that is undergoing renovations to become the new site of the Visitor Centre and museum.

Advantage Hope receives annual funding from the District of Hope in the amount of $250,000, approximated at $150K for economic development and $100K for tourism (Visitor Centre Operations). Other sources of funding include grants, retail sales from the Visitor Centre, donations to the museum, plus funding through the DBC co-operative marketing program with Cascades & Canyons and Scenic 7BC estimated at another $100K. In 2015, without MRDT, AdvantageHOPE was able to leverage 3:1 return on investment for every dollar funded from the District of Hope.

Total budget is estimated at $300K.

MISSION

Mission held a meeting with council and key tourism stakeholders in August 2015, to determine how tourism development services should be managed. The decision was made to investigate whether moving away from the current partnership with the Mission Economic Development Office and Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC) to a stand-alone DMO is viable. This process is now underway and when the District of Mission decides to proceed, it is anticipated to take approximately three years for the new DMO to become largely self-sustaining.
5.0 GOVERNANCE

The economic development mandate is focused on business retention, expansion, and investment attraction. For tourism, Council and tourism stakeholders have determined that a DMO is necessary. This plan presents a four-year transitional plan to develop a non-profit, stand-alone DMO for the delivery of tourism development services in Mission. It also removes tourism services from the EDO and introduces the MRCC as the interim body to manage the transition, requiring at least one full-time staff that is solely dedicated to this role. The DMO would have a Board of Tourism Advisors made up of a cross section of tourism operators, ranging from hoteliers to restaurant owners.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The not-for-profit society would be a stakeholder model as opposed to a member-based model. The weakness of a member-based model is that the tourism organization then serves the needs of its members rather than the best interests of the tourism region as a whole. Regional tourism associations have moved to a stakeholder model.

The make-up of the Tourism Advisory Committee and of the Board of Directors will be an issue of in-depth discussion. A proposed structure is detailed below.

- 8-10 members.
  - 1 representative from District of Mission or Mission Economic Development.
  - 1 from the Chamber of Commerce.
  - 1-4 from the accommodation sector (MRDT eligible properties).
  - 1 from the food and beverage industry.
  - 1 from heritage, arts, and culture including Aboriginal culture.
  - 1 from outdoor adventure (including fishing, nature tours, and the Mission Municipal Forest).
  - 1-2 open seats (could include attractions, festivals and events, agricultural, golf course or retail).

Accommodation seats take priority.

A representative of Vancouver Coast & Mountains Tourism Region could also be an invited guest to ensure coordination.

The recommended seats, on this Tourism Advisory Committee, reflect the needed growth in visitor activities and appropriate hotel accommodation before significant overnight leisure travel could take place. The importance of attractions and activities, with respect to motivating potential travellers to Mission, is best represented by the Tourism Advisory Committee/Board of Directors. Adjustments may need to be made in the medium to long-term to reflect a greater emphasis on overnight stays.

However, and consistent with other tourism organizations, the number of members from the accommodation sector should be less than 50% to ensure fairness.

It will be important that the members of the Tourism Advisory Committee/Board of Directors have a big-picture view and agree that while each may represent a particular sector of the community, each committee member has the responsibility to achieve the best possible results for Mission, as a whole, and is not an advocate for any particular business or sector. The skill sets and knowledge of each member are also important, such that a member coming from a particular sector should have expertise in this sector. Each member’s responsibility includes communicating the tourism organization’s activities to his/her sector, ensuring that all sector groups are knowledgeable, and support Tourism Mission, overall.

Board appointees would require a minimum of two years of service to be eligible.
An oversight committee will appoint the first board and will consist of five people — one staff member from the District of Mission, Economic Development Officer (Stacey Crawford), two Project Managers/Consultants, and a Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce representative.

The Board will then appoint its own Chair and select board members in the future via nomination.

Tourism Mission needs to have at least one full-time staff person. Volunteer resources would be used to assist paid staff.

---

FIGURE 16: PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONAL CHART FOR TOURISM MISSION
6.0  TIMELINE

This timeline is an approximate outline of activities that will occur in the given four-year plan.

YEAR 1: 2017

JANUARY 2017
First payment from the District of Mission for Tourism Mission will be received by the MRCC to manage and handle the accounting services for Tourism Mission in Year 1. This does not include the existing Visitor Centre budget.

JANUARY 15TH – JANUARY 30TH, 2017
Tourism Mission is formed and overseen by an oversight committee (District Staff, Chamber Representative, Chamber Executive Director, Economic Development, and Project Managers) for the first year until the board is formed. The MRCC will manage the budget for the first year via the MRCC Board, which will take recommendations from the oversight committee. The oversight committee will be responsible for hiring the Executive Director (ED) and appointing the Board of Directors for the newly formed Tourism Mission organization. The Executive Director of the DMO will work directly with the Executive Director of the MRCC to accomplish the goals and budget obligations in Year 1. The Chamber ED will report to the Chamber Board and the DMO ED will report to the oversight committee.

FEBRUARY 15TH, 2017
Project managers are hired by the MRCC on a 1-year contract to project manage and be a part of the oversight committee. Although funding for these positions will run through the MRCC, these positions will be independent of the MRCC to best represent the interests of forming an independent DMO.

MARCH 1ST, 2017
• DMO ED is hired.

MARCH 15TH - OCTOBER 1ST 2017
The oversight committee will work with the DMO ED, and Chamber ED to form a tourism board and begin the process of creating a governance model. The intern board members will be selected and in place by October 1st 2017. From October to December 31st, the board will then be focused on their governance model being in place to best govern the stand-alone DMO in Year 2.

MARCH 30TH – JULY 30TH, 2017
• Tourism Mission branding initiative begins and finalizes.

MARCH 30TH 2017
• DMO ED creates a detailed budget plan for office equipment and supplies for the oversight committee to review and approve.
• DMO ED begins execution of securing office equipment and supplies.

The project managers will create a 2017 partner funding operations plan, which will include management of the Scenic7BC campaign. Tourism Mission can immediately start benefiting from this partner funding. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the oversight committee, and sections of the plan will be presented to the Scenic7BC Board of Directors.
MARCH 30TH – JULY 30TH 2017

Working with the project managers, the DMO ED will create a detailed operations plan for Year 2 that the newly formed intern board will review and approve. Recommendations by the oversight committee will be reviewed in November of 2017.

MARCH 30TH – APRIL 30TH 2017

• Working with the project managers, the DMO ED will create a detailed budget plan for the Marketing Assets Budget, which the oversight committee will review and approve.

• Working with the project managers, the DMO ED will create a job description for the first employee to be reviewed and approved by the oversight committee.

APRIL 1ST – MAY 15TH 2017

• DMO ED hires the first employee.

APRIL 1ST – JULY 1ST 2017

Working with the project managers, the DMO ED creates a marketing and communications plan and detailed budget for the oversight committee to review and approve.

JULY 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2017

• DMO ED executes the marketing & communications plan.

SEPTEMBER 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2017

• Chamber ED & DMO ED create a 2018 Visitor Services Operations Plan for the DMO board and the oversight committee to review.

OCTOBER 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2017

• Tourism Mission begins visitor services training and prepares to take over operations in Year 2.

• DMO ED creates a Year 1 Operations Report for the Board, AGM, and District of Mission

NOVEMBER 1ST DECEMBER 1ST 2017

• DMO ED presents the Year 2 Operations Plan to the Tourism Board and the oversight committee for review and approval.
YEAR 2: 2018

JAN 1ST – JAN 31ST 2018
• DMO Board is fully formed and ready to govern. First payment, from the District of Mission, will go directly to Tourism Mission.
• Tourism oversight committee dissolves.
• Project managers are hired by Tourism Mission to provide recommendations to the board and to work with the ED for one year.
• MRCC provides the District of Mission and the DMO Board a full-scale financial report on all Tourism Mission financial records for Year 1.
• DMO Board presents the Year 1 Operation Report to the District of Mission.

JAN 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2018
• DMO ED executes the Year 2 Operations Plan.
• Tourism Mission takes over the operations of Visitor Services from the MRCC, which will be included in the Year 2 Operations Plan.

FEBRUARY 1ST – NOVEMBER 1ST 2018
• DMO ED creates a Year 3 Operations Plan.

NOVEMBER 1ST – NOVEMBER 15TH 2018
• DMO ED presents a Year 3 Operations Plan to the Board for review and approval.

OCTOBER 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST
• DMO ED creates a Year 2 Operations Report for the Board, AGM, and District of Mission.

YEAR 3: 2019

JANUARY 1ST – JANUARY 31ST 2019
• Tourism Mission Board releases 2018 financial statements and Year 2 Operations Report to the District of Mission.
• Project management for DMO creation dissolves.

JANUARY 1ST – MARCH 1ST 2019
DMO ED selects a DBC-recommended MRDT consultant to work with the District of Mission, Tourism Mission and the Mission accommodations sector create an MRDT plan to be executed this year.

JANUARY 31ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2019
• DMO ED executes the Year 3 Operations Plan.

FEBRUARY 1ST 2016 – NOVEMBER 1ST
• DMO ED creates a Year 4 Operations Plan.
MARCH 1ST 2019 – JUNE 1ST 2019
• DMO ED works with a MRDT consultant to create the MRDT plan.

JUNE 1ST - OCTOBER 1ST 2019
• MRDT Plan execution process.
• DMO ED works with the Board to create a presentation, and proposal to the District of Mission, to discuss the possibilities of a continued funding relationship.

OCTOBER 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2019
• MRDT implementation.
• DMO ED creates a Year 3 Operations Report for the Board, AGM, and District of Mission.

NOVEMBER 1ST – NOVEMBER 15TH 2019
• DMO ED presents the Year 4 Operations Plan to the Board for review and approval.

OCTOBER 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2019
• DMO ED and Board present the proposal to the District of Mission and host a forum to discuss ongoing cooperation.

YEAR 4: 2020

JANUARY 1ST 2020
• Accommodations within the Tourism Mission region begin collecting MRDT.

JAN 1ST – JAN 31ST 2020
• DMO Board releases Year 3 financials to the District of Mission.
• DMO board presents the Year 3 Operations Report to the District of Mission.

JAN 1ST – DECEMBER 31ST 2020
• DMO ED executes the Year 4 Operations Plan.

FEBRUARY 1ST – NOVEMBER 1ST 2020
• DMO ED creates the Year 5 Operations Plan.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS + CONCLUDING REMARKS

While Mission has the ‘raw materials’ and market-ready products/services to develop tourism and is poised for growth, it lacks critical mass. Most of Mission’s experiences are geared towards small pockets of tourism product; however, there isn’t enough of what we call ‘cluster experiences’ to draw multiple-day visits. For matched funding assistance and to attract visitors coming from different communities, collaborative marketing is a significant piece of this strategy. Forming a consortium and supporting initiatives, such as the Scenic 7BC will leverage cooperative marketing program funds to reach more people in a shorter amount of time and encourage multiple-day stays in the area. Mission’s Visitor Centre’s geographical location is the perfect hub.

To achieve long-term growth and critical mass, Tourism Mission needs to support start-up and established tourism businesses whose products/services align with the objectives and goals of this strategic plan. Product categories, with the purpose of motivating visitors, to be developed and promoted are as follows:

**Fraser River-focused outdoor activities, with emphasis on guided fishing and soft adventure activities.** Guided fishing, particularly sturgeon fishing, that is rated among the best in the world and soft adventure tours, which are medium to high motivators for travel. As product development occurs, with greater capacity and infrastructure for sport fishing and potential development of the waterfront with parks, hotels, and more water-based activities, Mission will gain momentum.

**Nature-based outdoor activities, including planned development of Stave West.** With the planned development of Stave West, Mission has an opportunity to distinguish itself with new and unique outdoor activities. The list of potential activities should be compelling over the long-term. For example, soft outdoor adventure experiences with an educational component highlighting the culture of Mission might be considered as well as fun outdoor experiences, such as zip-lining.

**Heritage, arts, and cultural attractions, including Aboriginal cultural attractions.** Mission has important assets that can increase visitor satisfaction and length of stay. Xa:ytem, Power House at Stave Falls, Westminster Abbey, the heritage buildings, in downtown Mission, and the story of ‘firsts’ distinguish the community from other destinations and help share the unique in Mission.

**Signature festivals and events.** While Mission has a number of festivals and events, there is ample opportunity to develop one or two off-season festivals and events.

**Mission Raceway** has potential to help generate additional tourism revenue upon greater integration with the tourism industry.

**Sport tourism.** While sport tourism is not, currently, a major priority in Mission, the community can still benefit as witnessed by the 2014 BC Winter Games that were held in Mission.

In closing, a quote by Duncan Adams of the Roanoke Time states it best:

“Communities that people want to visit are places where people want to live and work. These same communities become places businesses have to be. Tourism becomes like a ‘first date’, with marketing campaigns by tourism bureaus as matchmakers and jobs and economic growth as offspring.”
Global tourism is one of the largest and fastest-growing economic sectors in the world. 2015 was no exception, with international tourist arrivals (ITA) growing 4.4% over 2014 to reach 1,184 million. Over the past two decades ITAs have grown 125% from 527 million in 1995. In fact, ITAs have grown by 4% or more every year since 2010 (Figure 5).

In 2015, Europe led growth in ITA with a 5% increase over 2014. North America saw a 4% increase in ITAs. Arrivals to the Middle East grew about 3% and arrival to Africa declined by 3%.

Spending by tourists follow a similar pattern. In 2014, spending by tourists was estimated to be $1,245 billion US dollars. This represents 3.7% growth over 2013 and 29% growth since 2010.

Looking forward to 2016, global ITA growth is projected to be about 4%. Similarly, the Americas are expected to grow in international visitor arrivals somewhere between 4% and 5%. Longer term, continued growth, is expected over the next two decades.

Per the UNWTO’s Tourism Towards 2030, the number of international tourist arrivals worldwide is expected to increase by an average of 3.3% a year over the period 2010 to 2030.44

CONSUMER SHIFTS AND TRENDS

The following consumer shifts have impacted the worldwide travel industry:

- There is expected to be increasing competition for global tourist dollars as more destinations are seeing the economic benefits of tourism and are aggressively trying to attract visitors.
- Nature will be increasingly valuable in a world with rapidly urbanizing populations and disappearing natural habitats. Concern about the impact on the planet and ethical issues is on the ascendancy, especially among the younger generation, but is evident across all ages.
- Travellers are increasingly seeking memorable experiences that are authentic, personalized and involve social and cultural interaction. The experience travellers have while in a destination has increased in importance for driving visitation. Positive guest experiences are critical to garner word of mouth referrals and broaden awareness through social media.
- Digital mobile technologies are changing the way people communicate, access information, assess credibility, and make decisions, over the last five years. With social media, individuals can influence the thinking of millions in hours or minutes. Mobile technology is also allowing travellers to shift plans and change bookings very quickly. Despite all the digital opportunities, face-to-face interactions remain paramount.
- As the Path to Purchase model changes, destinations need to provide travel prospects a wide variety of types of travel information through many different channels.
- With the increased availability of trip planning information, travellers are seeking curated content sources that saves them time. This includes both the increase in the appeal of visual content (images and videos), as well as edited content that helps them navigate the clutter.
- People are travelling more frequently and go to more destinations than before, not simply for leisure, but for business, conferences, events, trade and health care. Travel is often multi-purpose.
- The rise of the sharing economy has solidified the legitimacy of disruptive travel experiences\(^45\), such as Airbnb and Uber. These new travel sources are attractive to millennials.
- Changing demographics with aging baby boomers and an increase in middle class from many overseas markets. As the populations of developed countries age, tourism will need to account for the preferences and needs of older travellers. Individual incomes have risen in most countries, making more products and services affordable, which is changing people’s attitudes towards work and leisure.
- Consumers are becoming more sophisticated travellers, with a corresponding increase in the expectations of quality service delivery.\(^46\)
- Interest has grown for multiple activities and experiences packaged as a complete itinerary.

CANADIAN TOURISM ENVIRONMENT

2014 was a strong year for the tourism sector in Canada, with particularly strong increases in arrivals from the key markets where Destination Canada invests in marketing and promotion with their partners, which includes Australia, Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Japan, Mexico, South Korea and the UK. All major tourism indicators for Canada rose, especially tourism revenue, GDP, employment and arrivals, per Destination Canada research estimates\(^47\):

- Total overnight trips to Canada increased by 3.2% to 17.1 Million.
- Total revenue generated from international visitors increased by 4.9% to $17.3 Billion.

---

\(^{45}\) Disruptive travel experiences are defined as a development that overturns traditional business models

\(^{46}\) Sources: Destination BC, UNWTO, Skift

\(^{47}\) 2014 Annual Report: Tourism as Canada’s Engine for Growth, Destination Canada
• Overnight trips to Canada from Destination Canada markets increased by 10.1% to 2.94 Million. European markets noted include Germany up 3.5% to 301,000 visitors and UK up 4.8% to 644,000 visitors.
• Revenues generated from Destination Canada markets increased by 13.7% to $4.74 Billion.

BC TOURISM ENVIRONMENT

Tourism is a critical sector within BC’s economy:

• In 2014, the tourism industry generated $14.6 billion in revenue, a 5.1% increase from 2013, and a 37.7% increase from 2004.
• In 2014, Municipal and Regional District Tax (MRDT) revenue grew by +9.0% over 2013 and reached a total of $1.7 billion. The tourism industry contributed $7.1 billion of value added to the BC economy, as measured through GDP (in 2007 constant dollars). This represents 4.5% growth over 2013 and 13.1% growth since 2007.
• In 2014, there were 18,682 tourism-related businesses in BC, down 3.0% from 2013 and up 3.6% from 2004.
• The tourism industry employed 127,500 people in 2014, an increase of 2.2% over 2013 and 18.4% over 2004. In 2014, the tourism industry paid $4.3 billion in wages and salaries, up 4.5% from 2013 and a 30.2% increase since 2004.

Tourism plays an important role in diversifying the economic base throughout British Columbia. The following provides an overview of the current operating environment and some of the challenges faced by the industry.

• Rise of the US travel market after years of decline. The low Canadian dollar and favourable gas prices may also positively impact visitations from the US travel market to BC.
• The low Canadian dollar is also impacting Canadian travel patterns: 2015 Canadian reentries into BC from the US were down 10.7% in 2015 compared to 2014, however the number of re-entries from other international countries was up 11.4%.
• The recent slump in oil prices has caused the Alberta economy to enter a recession and has negatively impacted consumer confidence and spending. Alberta residents are becoming increasingly less confident about their own situation and are cutting back on their household purchases as a result.
• According to the B.C. Tourism Labour Market Strategy, there are pending labour shortages for tourism throughout BC. There is a requirement for 101,000 jobs by 2020; 44,000 new jobs and 71,000 job replacements.
• There has been a growth in the awareness and availability of aboriginal tourism experiences throughout BC, with efforts led by Aboriginal Tourism Association British Columbia (AtBC).
• In general, there has been an increase in the number of destinations throughout BC looking to tourism to increase their local economy.

More recent BC tourism performance indicators showed an exceptional year of growth for the BC tourism industry (Figure 6). There was an increase of 8% in total overnight, international visitor arrivals, which was mostly due to almost 10% annual growth in visitation from the United States. Overnight arrivals from Asia/Pacific (5%) and Europe (4%) also grew. Also, BC provincial hotel occupancy rates (up 2.2 points), average daily room rates (up 9%), food service and drinking place receipts (up 7%) and passenger volume to YVR (5%) all showed the strength of the tourism industry in 2015.

50 Source: Alberta Government Economic Commentary, November 6, 2015
BRITISH COLUMBIA TOURISM PERFORMANCE, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Visitor Arrivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overnight</td>
<td>4,925,916</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Overnight</td>
<td>3,263,395</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>1,049,466</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>473,166</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Parties to BC Visitor Centre</td>
<td>1,272,014</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Revenue ($000)</td>
<td>$2,002,682</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Hotel Occupancy Rate (Average)</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>2.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Average Daily Room Rate</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places Receipts</td>
<td>$9,541,000</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passenger Volume to YVR</td>
<td>20,316,978</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


VANCOUVER, COAST AND MOUNTAINS TOURISM CONTEXT

Closer to Scenic 7, Vancouver, Coast and Mountain tourism indicators show positive results from 2015 (Figure 7). All tourism indicators were up except for VCM travel parties to visitor centres, which were down -31.2%.

VANCOUVER, COAST AND MOUNTAINS TOURISM PERFORMANCE, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Tourism Performance</th>
<th>2015 Performance</th>
<th>Percent Change 2015/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCM Travel Parties to Visitor Centres</td>
<td>319,140</td>
<td>-31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Room Revenue ($000)</td>
<td>$659,685</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Hotel Occupancy</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>3.4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Vancouver Hotel Occupancy</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>3.1 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley/Surrey Hotel Occupancy</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>5.2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford/Chilliwack Hotel Occupancy</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>5.1 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Average Daily Room Rate</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Vancouver Average Daily Room Rate</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley/Surrey Average Daily Room Rate</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford/Chilliwack Average Daily Room Rate</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YVR Vancouver — Total Passenger Volume</td>
<td>20,316,978</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsford — Total Passenger Volume</td>
<td>487,833</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B – VISITOR ANALYSIS

SHORT-HAUL MARKETS: BC, ALBERTA, AND WASHINGTON

The following information has been provided to look specifically at the BC, Alberta and Washington travel markets, which were determined to be the three markets of greatest potential for the marketing partnership efforts. The charts were published in the Destination BC 2016/17 Marketing Plan. Further information for all BC tourism markets can be found on www.destinationbc.ca/Research/Research-by-Market/All-Market-Profiles

Please see the following three pages:
BRITISH COLUMBIA

Market Overview

- Domestic Trips by British Columbia Residents: 12.2 million
- Overnight Trips by British Columbia Residents in BC: 10.6 million (86%)
- Total Spending in BC: $3.2 billion

Repeat Visitation

- 24 Times in Past 2 Years: 80%
- 2+ Times in Past 5 Years: 67%

Impression of BC

- Positive Impression: 91%

Recommend BC

- Net Promoter Score: +72

Explorer Quotient

- Gentle Explorer: 36%
- Free Spirit: 17%
- Authentic Experience: 16%
- Cultural Explorer: 10%
- No Hotel Traveler: 5%

Age

- 18-24 years: 14%
- 25-34 years: 28%
- 35-44 years: 18%
- 45-54 years: 20%
- 55-64 years: 16%
- 65+ years: 11%

Trip Purpose

- Leisure: 42%
- Visiting Friends/Relatives: 44%
- Business: 7%
- Other: 8%

Travel Party Size

- 2.7 People

Booking Method

- Flight: 5%
- Accommodation: 3%
- Rental Car: 26%
- Land-Based Activity: 8%
- Other: 20%

Market Insights

In 2014, British Columbia residents accounted for 57% of BC’s total overnight visitation and continued to be BC’s largest market.

BC captured 86% of all domestic overnight travel by British Columbia residents in 2014. This represents an estimated 10.6 million British Columbia residents travelling within BC in 2014 and approximately $3.2 billion was generated in tourist receipts.

Month of Visit

- Jan: 7%
- Feb: 8%
- Mar: 6%
- Apr: 8%
- May: 13%
- Jun: 13%
- Jul: 12%
- Aug: 6%
- Sep: 8%
- Oct: 13%
- Nov: 6%
- Dec: 13%

Visits by Region

- Lower Mainland: 24%
- Vancouver Island: 41%
- Northern British Columbia: 5%
- Southeast: 5%
- Cariboo / Chilcotin Coast: 3%
- Kootenay Rockies: 6%
- Kootenay Plains: 20%
- Thompson Okanagan: 20%

Top 10 Activities

1. Beach
2. Hiking / Backpacking
3. Visit Friends / Family
4. Camping
5. Visit Parks
6. Boating
7. Wildlife Viewing
8. Fishing
9. Cycling
10. Play Sports

Transportation

- Auto / Camper / RV: 84%
- Ship / Ferry: 5%
- Commercial Aircraft: 4%
- Bus: 3%
- Train: 1%
- Other: 0.2%

Trip Length in BC

- 1-2 Nights: 64%
- 3-5 Nights: 28%
- 6-9 Nights: 5%
- 10-16 Nights: 2%
- 17-30 Nights: 1%
- 31+ Nights: 0.4%

Top Trends for British Columbia

Domestic air capacity to BC (YVR) increased (up 5%) in 2014 over 2013.

The depreciation of the Canadian dollar, relative to the US dollar, contributed to increased domestic travel by British Columbia residents in BC.

British Columbia residents have a Net Promoter Score of +72, meaning that they are very likely to recommend BC as a travel destination to their Friends and Family.

The majority (92%) of overnight trips taken by British Columbia residents in BC are a length of 5 days or less.

Average Trip Spending per Person

- $144 Per Person
  - Food / Beverage: $34 30%
  - Accommodation: $32 22%
  - Public / Local Transportation: $30 21%
  - Public Transportation: $15 11%
  - Retail / Other: $12 8%
ALBERTA

Market Overview

Domestic Trips by Alberta Residents
11.9 million

Overnight Trips by Alberta Residents in BC
2.5 million (21%)

Total Spending in BC
$1.2 billion

Alberta Residents are BC's #2 Domestic Market

Repeat Visitation
46% 2+ Times in Past 2 Years
65% 2+ Times in Past 5 Years

Impression of BC
88% Positive Impression

Recommend BC
Net Promoter Score
+63

Explorer Quotient

Gentle Explorer 38%
Free Spirit 21%
Authentic Experience 13%
Culture Explorer 12%
Personal History Explorer 4%

Age
18-24 years 11%
25-34 years 25%
35-44 years 19%
45-54 years 16%
55-64 years 16%
65+ years 8%

Trip Purpose
Leisure 55%
Visiting 35%
Friends / Relatives 6%
Business 4%
Other 5%

Travel Party Size
3.1 People

Booking Method
Flight 5%
Car 45%
Train 24%
Bus 18%
Other 5%

Accommodation
Travel Agent 30%
OTA 26%
Visitor Centre 20%
BC Nudging 18%
Other 5%

Month of Visit
Jan 7% Feb 6% Mar 5% Apr 7% May 6% Jun 10% Jul 23% Aug 23% Sep 10% Oct 5% Nov 6% Dec 7%

Transportation
Auto / Camper / RV 75%
Commercial Aircraft 22%
Bus 1%
Ship / Ferry 0.2%
Train 0.1%
Other 1%

Top 10 Activities
1. Hiking / Backpacking
2. Beach
3. Visit Parks
4. Boating
5. Visit Friends / Family
6. Camping
7. Golfing
8. Wildlife Viewing
9. Museum / Art Gallery
10. Historic Site

Visits by Region

Top Trends for Alberta

Alberta's expected increase of real GDP in 2015 is forecasted to be larger than other provinces, including BC.
The depreciation of the Canadian dollar, relative to the US dollar, contributed to the share of domestic travel by Canadians.
Alberta residents have very well-developed perceptions of BC's appeals for scenery and nature, and a strong emotional connection to the natural aspects of BC.
Overnight travel to BC by Alberta travellers peak in July and August; during these months, overnight visitation by Alberta travellers is seen more than any other domestic market.

Trip Length in BC

Average 4.4 Nights

1-2 Nights 36%
3-5 Nights 40%
6-9 Nights 15%
10-16 Nights 8%
17-30 Nights 2%
31+ Nights 0.2%

Average Trip Spending per Person

$225 Per Person

Food / Beverage $68 30%
Accommodation $61 27%
Private Vehicle $39 17%
Public / Local Transportation $25 11%
Recreation / Entertainment $19 9%
Retail / Other $13 6%
WASHINGTON

Market Overview
- Outbound Trips from Washington: 1.9 million
- Overnight Trips from Washington to BC: 1.2 million (62%)
- Total Spending in BC: $428.5 million
- Washington is #1 BC's market from the United States

Repeat Visitation
- 18% 2+ times in past 2 years
- 35% 2+ times in past 5 years

Impression of BC
- 77% Positive Impression

Recommend BC
- +62 Net Promoter Score

Explorer Quotient
- Gentle Explorer: 34%
- Authentic Experience: 18%
- Free Spirit: 15%
- Cultural Explorer: 10%
- Regenerator: 7%

Age
- <20 years: 13%
- 20-34 years: 13%
- 35-44 years: 13%
- 45-54 years: 17%
- 55-64 years: 22%
- 65+ years: 22%

Trip Purpose
- Leisure: 63%
- Visiting Friends/Family: 24%
- Business: 5%
- Other: 8%

Travel Party Size
- 3.0 People

Booking Method
- 40% Flight
- 38% Accommodation

Month of Visit
- January: 5%
- February: 5%
- March: 8%
- April: 8%
- May: 8%
- June: 6%
- July: 5%
- August: 10%
- September: 10%
- October: 6%
- November: 5%
- December: 9%

Visits by Region
- Vancouver Island: 20%
- Vancouver, Coast & Mountains: 75%
- Thompson Okanagan: 6%
- Northern British Columbia: 5%
- Cariboo Chilcotin Coast: 4%

Top Trends for Washington
- Following the 2009 recession, the US economy began a steady rebound, positively impacting the tourism sector with US International travel increasing 3% in 2013 and a further 2% in 2014.
- Over half of Americans' international trips are within North America, with Mexico being the most frequently visited destination by one third of all US travelers, followed by Canada receiving one-fifth of US outbound travel.
- Overnight travel to BC by Washington travelers peak in July and August, however visitation is seen more frequently across all other months than California travelers.

Traveler Insights
- The US was BC’s largest international market in 2014, accounting for 67% of BC’s international overnight visitation.
- Washington travelers, specifically, represented 41% of all US visitation to BC.
- Washington was BC’s third largest market of BC’s total overnight visitation in 2014, accounting for 6% of the market share.
- An estimated 1.2 million travelers from Washington visited BC in 2014, generating approximately $428.5 million in tourist receipts.

Top 10 Activities
- 1- Shopping
- 2- Sightseeing
- 3- Visit Friends/Family
- 4- Outdoor Activities
- 5- Night Club
- 6- Visit Parks
- 7- Museum/Art Gallery
- 8- Downhill Ski
- 9- Historic Site
- 10- Zoo/Aquarium

Average Trip Spending per Person
- $266 Per Person
- Accommodation: $90 34%
- Food & Beverage: $76 28%
- Recreation/Entertainment: $43 16%
- Transportation: $25 9%
- Other: $32 12%

Average Trip Length in BC
- 1-3 Nights: 60%
- 3-4 Nights: 18%
- 4-6 Nights: 15%
- 7-10 Nights: 5%
- 11-14 Nights: 1%
- 15-20 Nights: 0.4%
- 21-29 Nights: 0.4%
- 30+ Nights: 0.4%

Transportation
- Auto: 83%
- Boat: 6%
- Plane: 3%
- Bus: 1%
- Train: 1%
- Other: 6%
VANCOUVER, COAST AND MOUNTAINS REGIONAL PROFILE

At the provincial level, Destination British Columbia produced regional profiles for each of the tourism regions in the province. Key findings from the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains profile include:

- The Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region received 8.2 million overnight person-visits in 2012 and generated $4.7 billion in related spending.
- Of all travellers in BC (business, leisure, visiting friends and/or relatives, and other), Vancouver, Coast and Mountains received 43% share of overnight visitors, 57% of spending and 50% of nights. When looking just at leisure travellers, the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region received 43% share of overnight visitors, 52% of spending and 42% of nights.
- British Columbia residents make up the largest share of overnight visitation (46%), but has a much lower spending (22%).
- On average, domestic travel parties in the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains stayed 3.4 nights and spent $155 per night during their trip. US travel parties stayed 3.6 nights and spent $236 per night during their trip, and Other international travel parties stayed 13.6 nights and spent $126 per night during their trip in the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region.
- Same-day travellers accounted for 49% of visitor volume and 16% of visitor expenditures (Figure 8).
- Same day vs Overnight Visitor Volume and Expenditures

SAME DAY VS OVERNIGHT VISITOR VOLUME AND EXPENDITURES

- Over half of all traveller nights in the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region were spent in the residences of friends and family for the British Columbia market, other Canadians, and other international visitors, excluding US travelers, where 2/3 of travelers stayed in hotels and motels.
- Overnight travellers who spent one or more nights in the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region took part in a number of outdoor activities during their trip, including visiting national or provincial parks, visiting a beach, hiking/backpacking, and boating (Figure 9).
- Most people travelled in the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains region during the peak summer months.

Source: Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Regional Profile, January 2015, Destination BC

---

Source: Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Regional Profile, January 2015, Destination BC
### TOP ACTIVITIES ON A TRIP TO VANCOUVER, COAST AND MOUNTAINS REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC Residents</th>
<th>Other Canadians</th>
<th><strong>US Residents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other International</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 National, provincial or nature park</td>
<td>National, provincial or nature park</td>
<td>National, provincial or nature park</td>
<td>National, provincial or nature park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Camping</td>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>Historic Area</td>
<td>Zoo or aquarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Boating/canoeing/kayaking</td>
<td>Hiking or backpacking</td>
<td>Zoo or aquarium</td>
<td>Museum or art gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Beach</td>
<td>Museum or art gallery</td>
<td>Museum or art gallery</td>
<td>Historic site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fishing</td>
<td>Historic site</td>
<td>Downhill skiing or snowboarding</td>
<td>Festival or fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vancouver, Coast and Mountains Regional Profile, January 2015, Destination BC

*Please note that the activities listed could have taken place anywhere on the trip, not just in Vancouver, Coast and Mountains.

** Please note that the following activities were not included in this analysis: visit friends or family, shopping, sightseeing, bar/night club, sport/outdoor activity unspecified.


### 2012 IN-MARKET RESEARCH REPORT

The following are key highlights for the Vancouver, Coast and Mountains (VCM) region taken from the Destination BC British Columbia In-Market study conducted with BC, Alberta and Washington state travellers in November 2011.

- Visitors to any region in BC are looking for destinations which offer value for money, a place to relax and unwind and which serve as a good getaway from everyday life.
- Most respondents are familiar with VCM destinations, particularly Vancouver and Whistler.
- Key activities which motivated trips to VCM were sightseeing, nature, wildlife viewing, visiting friends or relatives, and hiking. (Figure 10)
- Over half (55%) of respondents are likely to visit VCM in the next two years, most likely for a ‘getaway’ (1-2 nights) or a ‘mini-vacation’ (3-5 nights) during the summer (Figure 11). Outdoor recreation activities and experiencing scenery and nature are key motivators for future trips to VCM. (Figure 12)
- The Internet (on a computer as opposed to a mobile device) is heavily relied-upon for pre-trip planning, while information centres and online (at accommodations) are the most popular information sources during trips.
- Preferring to visit a different or international location and lack of interest in visiting or returning to the region were key reasons given by respondents that are unlikely to take a trip to VCM in the next two years.
- Over half (52%) of visitors to VCM have a positive overall impression of the region, which ranks it 3rd out of the 6 British Columbia Tourism regions, after Vancouver Island and the Kootenay Rockies.

Visitors to Vancouver, Coast and Mountains destinations participated in a far greater range of activities while on their trip than they were originally motivated by. Sightseeing, visiting relatives and shopping were the most common trip motivators. Those activities with the largest gap in motivation vs. participation offer the largest opportunities to differentiate from competing destinations. (Figure 10)
VCM - MOTIVATING VS. PARTICIPATING ACTIVITIES, 2011

- Sightseeing/nature/wildlife viewing: 59% participated, 55% motivated
- Shopping: 54% participated, 48% motivated
- Hiking: 40% participated, 29% motivated
- Visiting friends, relatives: 31% participated, 22% motivated
- Visiting a large city or cities: 29% participated, 10% motivated
- Visiting national and/or provincial parks: 29% participated, 9% motivated
- Visiting historical sites: 21% participated, 2% motivated
- Visiting rural community or communities: 21% participated, 5% motivated
- Arts and cultural activities: 17% participated, 3% motivated
- Other outdoor recreation activities: 15% participated, 4% motivated
- Fished: 15% participated, 10% motivated
- Visiting aboriginal culture or heritage sites: 13% participated, 2% motivated
- Whale watching: 13% participated, 4% motivated
- Visiting a winery: 11% participated, 5% motivated
- Biking: 11% participated, 2% motivated

Base: Evaluated VCM, n=746.
VCM – TRIP DURATION AND SEASONALITY

Likelihood to Take Different Trip Durations (% top 2 box)

- Day trip: 21%
- Getaway (1-2 nights): 32%
- Mini-vacation (3-5 nights): 25%
- Vacation (6+ nights): 18%

Base: Evaluated VCM, n=745.

Season of Trip by Trip Type

- Day trip:
  - Winter: 12%
  - Spring: 38%
  - Summer: 72%
  - Fall: 10%
- Getaway:
  - Winter: 11%
  - Spring: 30%
  - Summer: 74%
  - Fall: 17%
- Mini-vacation:
  - Winter: 11%
  - Spring: 20%
  - Summer: 75%
  - Fall: 22%
- Vacation:
  - Winter: 9%
  - Spring: 21%
  - Summer: 78%
  - Fall: 22%

Base: Likely to take trip. Day, n=154, Getaway, n=238, Mini V, n=191, Vacation, n=135

VCM – MAIN ACTIVITIES FOR FUTURE TRIPS, 2011

- Outdoor recreation activities: 48%
- Experience scenery and nature: 32%
- Relax/unwind/rest: 16%
- Experience restaurants & nightlife: 11%
- Visit family/friends: 11%
- Skiing or snowboarding: 7%
- None: 5%
TOURING MARKET

Touring encompasses the range of experiences visitors participate in while travelling through a destination. Touring can be guided or self-guided and can utilize various forms of transportation (i.e., bicycle, motorcycle, motor coach, personal vehicle, rental car, or RV). Self-guided touring by motor vehicle (i.e., personal vehicle, rental car, or RV) is often referred to as the drive market. It is this type of touring that is the main focus of the Destination BC Touring Sector Profile, March, 2016.53

The touring market is primarily based on self-guided touring visitors. These visitors are about 44% of the Canadian population, 76% of which had 2 or more adults. On average they spend 8 nights in BC, in an average of 4 different locations, spending about $1,800 on the trip. More than half of this market used their own, while 21% used a rental car, and 13% travelled by RV. Of these travellers, RVs typically travelled further (2,200 kilometres), compared to cars (1,700 kilometres).

TOP BENEFITS OF TOURING

Source: Touring Sector Profile, 2014, Destination BC

The BC drive market is motivated to travel primarily by sightseeing (76%), opportunities for relaxation (60%), and availability of nature/scenery/parks (56%). Most self-guided touring visitors choose routes based on scenic value. Some followed official Circle Routes while in BC, majority incorporated parts of a route in their trip.

The top benefits of touring include being in control (75%), Having a car in the destination (69%) and driving when going to nearby destinations (65%) (Figure 13).

Top tourism regions to visit include Greater Vancouver (47%), Thompson Okanagan (46%), and Vancouver Island (41%). A 2009 Drive Market study conducted for Destination British Columbia revealed that the drive market of British Columbia is made up largely of British Columbian residents, accounting for 38% of the total market, followed by visitors from Alberta and Ontario, both contributing 15% of the market. International markets include Germany, Washington and United Kingdom. They are equally male/female, predominantly older – 66% were 55 or older, some with higher education, and generally have a middle income.

This market has a spontaneous nature and has moved from printed guides to online search and booking for travel needs. They have been conditioned to look for online deals, and enjoy personalized travel. Local and time-limited travel deals are a great product for this market.

Source: www.destinationbc.ca/Research/Research-by-Activity/Land-based.aspx
DESTINATION MARKETING ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONAL
— TRAVEL BEHAVIOURAL TRENDS

The following trends were identified within the Destination Marketing Association International (DMAI) Destination NEXT global industry report as “the 20 Trends Destination’s Need to Understand to Compete for Tourists”. The report was designed to help DMOs understand travel behavioral trends and suggest strategies to capitalize on those trends. The twenty trends are highlighted below:

6. Social media’s prominence in reaching the travel market (e.g., Facebook, Pinterest, Twitter, Weibo).
7. Mobile platforms and apps becoming the primary engagement platform for travellers.
8. Customers increasingly seeking a personalized travel experience.
9. Smart technology (e.g., phones, bag tags, and cards) creating new opportunities for innovative new services and processes.
10. Travellers demanding more information, control, interaction, and personalization.
11. Geo-targeting and localization becoming more prevalent.
12. Brand identity for destinations becoming more critical in terms of meeting planner perceptions about value and experience.
13. Customers increasingly looking for a travel experience that allows them to experience a local’s way of life.
14. Technology enabling faster decision-making by customers, thereby, increasing business to a destination.
15. Consumers becoming increasingly comfortable with ordering products online.
16. Hotel taxes increasingly vulnerable to alternative politically based projects.
17. Big Data arriving for the tourism industry.
18. The brand of a destination becoming a more important factor in travel decisions to consumers.
19. Governments facing pressure to reduce or eliminate direct financial subsidies to the tourism sector.
20. Short-stay trips and mini vacations becoming increasingly popular.
21. More third-party information providers aggregating content about destinations.
22. Peer-to-peer buyer influence driving customer purchases.
23. Governments dealing with tourism from an integrated, multi-departmental perspective, focused on economic development.
24. Customers increasingly going directly to suppliers for goods and services.
25. Economic conditions continuing to be highly volatile, subject to global and regional shocks.

APPENDIX C: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

APRIL 27 – PLANNING SESSION
Andrea Walker  Mission Chamber of Commerce Board Member
Michael Boronowski  District of Mission
Clare Seeley  Economic Development of Mission
Rich Vigurs  Fraser Valley Mountain Biking Association
Jo-Anne Leon  Kilby Historic Site
Denyse Tavener  Communities in Bloom
Kat Wahamaa  Mission Arts Council
Riley Forman  Connect Media
Summer Dhillon  Slap Communications
Kristin Parsons  Mission Chamber of Commerce
Joanne Chadwick  Mission Chamber of Commerce

JUNE 3 – PLANNING SESSION
Rich Vigurs  Fraser Valley Mountain Biking Association
Joanna McBride  Fraser River Heritage Park
Stacey Crawford  Economic Development of Mission
Kelly Cameron  District of Mission
Janis Schultz  Powerhouse at Stave Falls
Riley Forman  Connect Media
Summer Dhillon  Slap Communications
Kristin Parsons  Mission Chamber of Commerce
Joanne Chadwick  Mission Chamber of Commerce

JUNE 14 – INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS
Chester Huan  Mission City Best Western
Ken Lowe  Mission Raceway
Bick Benedict  Mission Harbour Authority
Summer Dhillon  Slap Communications
Kristin Parsons  Mission Chamber of Commerce

JULY 19 – HOTEL MANAGERS’ MEETING TO DISCUSS MRDT
Pam Alexis  District of Mission
Ron Poole  District of Mission
Chester Huan  Mission Best Western
Carmen —  Best Western
Brian —  Diamond Head
Peter Harrison  Destination British Columbia
Summer Dhillon  Slap Communications
Kristin Parsons  Mission Chamber of Commerce
Joanne Chadwick  Mission Chamber of Commerce
## Mission Budget Year 1

### INCOME
- **District of Mission DMO Funding**: $95,000 per month (Total: $190,000)
- **District of Mission VIC Funding**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **BCVC Funding**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **Retail Programs**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **Partner Programs**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **HRD**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **OBC & Partner Funding**: $0 per month (Total: $0)

### OFFICE EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES
- **Computer Equipment**: $500 per month (Total: $6,000)
- **Technology / Office Other**: $500 per month (Total: $6,000)
- **Various Office Supplies**: $100 per month (Total: $1,200)
- **Stationary**: $0 per month (Total: $0)
- **Phone**: $200 per month (Total: $2,400)
- **Office Other / Furniture**: $2,000 per month (Total: $2,000)

### OPERATIONS
- **Transportation**: $100 per month (Total: $1,200)

### RENT
- **Rent**: $350 per month (Total: $4,200)

### MARKETING ASSETS
- **Branding**: $5,000 per month (Total: $10,000)
- **Website Developments**: $4,000 per month (Total: $8,000)
- **Photography**: $1,000 per month (Total: $4,000)
- **Filing**: $2,000 per month (Total: $6,000)
- **Copy**: $1,000 per month (Total: $2,000)
- **Graphic Art**: $1,000 per month (Total: $2,000)
- **Video Editing**: $1,000 per month (Total: $2,000)

### MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS
- **DBC Programs / Partner Programs**: $5,000 per month (Total: $10,000)
- **Public Relation**: $500 per month (Total: $4,500)
- **Social Media**: $500 per month (Total: $4,500)
- **Digital Marketing Other**: $1,000 per month (Total: $4,000)
- **Print & Signage**: $200 per month (Total: $800)
- **Print & Other Advertisement**: $500 per month (Total: $2,000)

### EVENTS
- **Hosting Events**: $200 per month (Total: $3,200)
- **Supporting Events**: $1,000 per month (Total: $1,000)

### TRAINING & CONSULTING
- **Consulting & Chamber Admin / Training**: $15,000 per month (Total: $30,000)

### SUBSCRIPTIONS
- **Subscriptions**: $200 per month (Total: $2,400)
- **Memberships**: $200 per month (Total: $2,400)

### MISCELLANEOUS
- **Miscellaneous**: $3,000 per month (Total: $3,000)
- **Insurances**: $2,000 per month (Total: $2,000)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting Balance</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>25,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>230,800</td>
<td>25,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET (Income - Expenses)</strong></td>
<td>71,100</td>
<td>-23,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>-24,400</td>
<td>-16,900</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>67,600</td>
<td>-22,400</td>
<td>-14,400</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>-23,400</td>
<td>-28,900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected End Balance</strong></td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>49,600</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>56,100</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>45,800</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME**
- District of Mission DMO Funding: 70,000
- District of Mission VIC Funding: 35,000
- BCC Funding: 5,000
- Retail Programs: 0
- Partner Programs: 0
- MRFD: 0
- Grants: 0
- DBC & Partner Funding: 0
- **Total INCOME**: 110,000

**LABOUR**
- Ex Dir: 3,800
- Labour Other: 4,500
- Accounting & HR: 1,200
- **Total LABOUR**: 9,500

**OFFICE EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES**
- Computer Equipment: 1,000
- Technology / Office Other: 500
- Various Office Supplies: 200
- Stationary: 200
- Phone: 400
- Office Other / Furniture: 1,000
- **Total OFFICE EQUIPMENT & SUPPLIES**: 3,300

**OPERATIONS**
- Transportation: 200
- Retail Program: 2,000
- VC Operations Other: 500
- **Total OPERATIONS**: 2,700

**RENT**
- Rent: 800
- **Total RENT**: 800

**MARKETING ASSETS**
- Website Developments: 1,000
- Photography: 3,000
- Filming: 3,000
- Graphic Art: 2,000
- Video Editing: 4,000
- **Total MARKETING ASSETS**: 13,000

**MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS**
- Partner Programs & DBC: 2,000
- Public Relation: 1,000
- Social Media: 1,000
- Digital Marketing Other: 500
- Print & Signage: 100
- Print & Other Advertisement: 300
- Partner Programs Local: 400
- **Total MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS**: 5,300

**HOSTING**
- Hosting Events: 200
- Supporting Events: 500
- **Total HOSTING**: 700

**TRAINING & CONSULTING**
- Consulting & Training: 2,000
- **Total TRAINING & CONSULTING**: 2,000

**SUBSCRIPTIONS**
- Subscriptions: 300
- Memberships: 300
- **Total SUBSCRIPTIONS**: 600

**MISCELLANEOUS**
- Miscellaneous: 300
- Insurances: 400
- Staff Incentive: 400
- **Total MISCELLANEOUS**: 1,100
### Mission Budget Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting Balance</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>98,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>33,025</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET (Income - Expenses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64,975</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected End Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>66,475</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME**
- District of Mission DMO Funding: 50,000
- District of Mission VIC Funding: 35,000
- BCVC Funding: 6,000
- Retail Programs: 3,000
- Partner Programs: 4,000
- MRDF: 0
- Grants: 0
- DBC & Partner Funding: 0

**Total INCOME** = 98,000

**LABOUR**
- Ex Dir: 4,000
- Labour Other: 4,500
- Accounting & HR: 1,300
- Total LABOUR = 9,800

**OFFICE EQUIPMENT**
- Computer Equipment: 500
- Technology Other: 500
- Various Office Supplies: 300
- Total OFFICE EQUIPMENT = 2,400

**OPERATIONS**
- Transportation: 200
- Retail Program: 1,800
- VC Operations Other: 400
- Total OPERATIONS = 2,400

**RENT**
- Rent: 825
- Total RENT = 825

**MARKETING ASSETS**
- Branding: 0
- Website Developments: 500
- Photography: 2,000
- Total MARKETING ASSETS = 9,000

**MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS**
- Partner Programs & DBC: 2,500
- Public Relation: 1,100
- Social Media: 1,100
- Digital Marketing Other: 1,000
- Print & Signage: 100
- Total MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS = 6,600

**HOSTING**
- Hosting Events: 200
- Supporting Events: 200
- Total HOSTING = 400

**TRAINING & CONSULTING**
- Consulting & Training: 2,000
- MRDF Expenses: 500
- Total TRAINING & CONSULTING = 2,500

**SUBSCRIPTIONS**
- Subscriptions: 200
- Total SUBSCRIPTIONS = 500

**MISCELLANEOUS**
- Miscellaneous: 300
- Insurances: 400
- Staff Incentive: 400
- Total MISCELLANEOUS = 1,100

**Total** = 42,000

**Average** = 30,675
## Mission Budget Year 4

### INCOME

| District of Mission DMO Funding | 20,000 |
| District of Mission VIC Funding | 35,000 |
| BCVC Funding | 7,000 |
| Retail Programs | 3,000 |
| Partner Programs | 5,000 |
| MRDT | 5,000 |
| Grants | 0 |
| DBLC & Partner Funding | 0 |
| **Total INCOME** | 75,000 |

### LABOUR

| Ex Dir | 4,500 |
| Labour Other | 5,000 |
| Accounting & HR | 1,400 |
| **Total LABOUR** | 10,900 |

### OFFICE EQUIPMENT

| Computer Equipment | 600 |
| Technology Other | 600 |
| Various Office Supplies | 0 |
| Stationary | 200 |
| Phone | 400 |
| Office Other / Furniture | 50 |
| **Total OFFICE EQUIPMENT** | 2,300 |

### OPERATIONS

| Transportation | 200 |
| Retail Program | 2,200 |
| VC Operations Other | 400 |
| **Total OPERATIONS** | 2,800 |

### RENT

| Rent | 850 |
| **Total RENT** | 850 |

### MARKETING ASSETS

| Branding | 0 |
| Website Developments | 0 |
| Photography | 200 |
| Filming | 400 |
| Copy | 100 |
| Graphic Art | 100 |
| Video Editing | 500 |
| **Total MARKETING ASSETS** | 1,400 |

### MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS

| Partner Programs & DBLC | 4,000 |
| Public Relation | 1,300 |
| Social Media | 1,300 |
| Digital Marketing Other | 1,500 |
| Print & Signage | 100 |
| Print & Other Advertisement | 300 |
| Partner Programs Local | 800 |
| **Total MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS** | 9,300 |

### EVENTS

| Hosting Events | 200 |
| Supporting Events | 300 |
| **Total EVENTS** | 500 |

### TRAINING & CONSULTING

| Consulting & Training | 500 |
| **Total TRAINING & CONSULTING** | 500 |

### SUBSCRIPTIONS

| Subscriptions | 200 |
| Memberships | 300 |
| **Total SUBSCRIPTIONS** | 500 |

### MISCELLANEOUS

| Miscellaneous | 300 |
| Insurances | 400 |
| Staff Incentive | 400 |
| **Total MISCELLANEOUS** | 1,100 |
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: \textit{Aug 27, 2016}

To: Deputy Corporate Officer

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic: \textit{(attach additional pages and supporting material as required)}

\underline{Noise & Speed violations on Cedar Street}

Preferred meeting date for delegation: \textit{October 3, 2016.}

Alternative meeting date for delegation:

Please refer to the Council Meeting Schedule on the District's website for dates of Council Meetings.

\underline{Laura Baker & Others}

Name(s) of presenter(s) \hspace{1cm} Name of group/organization (if applicable)

Are you requesting any financial or in-kind assistance from Council? \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Yes \hspace{1cm} No

If yes, provide details of requested assistance (including financial amounts, if applicable):

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Yes \hspace{1cm} No

If yes, what was the result? \textit{Booked for the October 3, 2016 Regular Council Meeting}

The deadline for submission of the request, including any presentation or supporting material, is 4:30 p.m. \textit{on the Monday preceding the date of the meeting}. Once the delegation request has been approved, presenter(s) will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to present at the agreed upon meeting. Presenter(s) are limited to discussing only the above topic during the delegation.

All or a portion of this meeting may be audio/video recorded, live-streamed and archived on the District of Mission website. Council is unable to hear issues addressing a concern after a public hearing has been held, or if the issue is outside the jurisdiction of the legal authority of the District. The District of Mission reserves the right to refuse any delegation request.

Information provided on this form will be published and made available for public viewing. Please submit a separate document with your contact information.
REQUEST TO APPEAR AS A DELEGATION

Date: Oct 25/16

To: Deputy Corporate Officer

I hereby request permission to appear as a delegation before District of Mission Mayor and Council with reference to the following topic: (attach additional pages and supporting material as required)

To the addition of a fourth court at the Centennial Park Tennis courts

Preferred meeting date for delegation: Nov 21/16

Alternative meeting date for delegation: 

Please refer to the Council Meeting Schedule on the District’s website for dates of Council Meetings

MARK GERVAIS
PIERRE ROBINSON
Name(s) of presenter(s)

MISSION TENNIS CLUB
Name of group/organization (if applicable)

Are you requesting any financial or in-kind assistance from Council? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide details of requested assistance (including financial amounts, if applicable):

Financial assistance for the cost of adding one tennis court

Have you spoken with District staff about this request? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what was the result? Spoke with Parks and Recreation

The deadline for submission of the request, including any presentation or supporting material, is 4:30 p.m. on the Monday preceding the date of the meeting. Once the delegation request has been approved, presenter(s) will be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes to present at the agreed upon meeting. Presenter(s) are limited to discussing only the above topic during the delegation. All or a portion of this meeting may be audio/video recorded, live-streamed and archived on the District of Mission website. Council is unable to hear issues addressing a concern after a public hearing has been held, or if the issue is outside the jurisdiction of the legal authority of the District. The District of Mission reserves the right to refuse any delegation request.

Information provided on this form will be published and made available for public viewing. Please submit a separate document with your contact information.
Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 464 and 466 of the Local Government Act, a Public Hearing will take place in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 21, 2016 to consider the following proposed bylaw:

DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5595-2016-5050(220) (R16-017 – Analytical Consulting)

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into three (3) residential compact lots of a minimum 465 square metre (5,005 square foot) lot size and one (1) remainder lot having a minimum 558 square metre (6,006 square foot) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:

Parcel Identifier: 004-531-795  
Lot 14 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12578

to rezone a portion of the property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone.

The location of the subject property is 7765 Horne Street and is shown on the following maps:

Copies of the proposed bylaw and report relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, November 11, 2016 to Monday, November 21, 2016. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “Public Meeting Information”. For further information regarding this bylaw, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748.

At the Public Hearing, persons who believe that their interest in property is affected by this proposed bylaw will have the opportunity to be heard.

Should you have any comments or concerns you wish to convey to Council and you cannot attend the meeting, please submit in writing to the Corporate Officer by 4:00 p.m. on Friday, November 18, 2016.

You may forward your submission by:

- Mailing or delivering to the Corporate Officer’s Office, P.O. Box 20, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC; V2V 4L9
- Faxing: 604-826-1363 (Attn: Corporate Officer)
- E-mail: info@mission.ca with PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS as the subject line

Please note: Submissions that are subject of a public hearing, public meeting or other public processes will be included, in their entirety, in the public information package and will form part of the public record. Council shall not receive further information or submissions after the conclusion of the Public Hearing.

Following the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, council may consider advancing bylaws forward for additional readings.

Michael Younie  
Corporate Officer  
Dated at Mission, BC  
this 8th day of November, 2016.
November 8, 2016

Dear Owner/Occupant:

Re: Rezoning Application R16-017 & Development Permit Application DP16-009
(Analytical Consulting) – 7765 Horne Street

As a property owner or neighbouring resident to the subject property located at 7765 Horne Street, you are invited to attend a Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 21, 2016 and make known any comments that you may have about the proposed bylaw.

The Public Hearing will be held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, BC.

The following is an excerpt from the Public Hearing Notice:

DISTRICT OF MISSION ZONING AMENDING BYLAW 5595-2016-5050(220) (R16-017 – Analytical Consulting)

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to accommodate the subsequent subdivision of the subject property into three (3) residential compact lots of a minimum 465 square metre (5,005 square foot) lot size and one (1) remainder lot having a minimum 558 square metre (6,006 square foot) lot size.

This bylaw proposes to amend District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by amending the zoning of the following legally described property:

- Parcel Identifier: 004-531-795
- Lot 14 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12578

to rezone a portion of the property from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone.

The location of the subject property is 7765 Horne Street and is shown on the following maps:
The purpose of the development permit is to provide conformity to the Official Community Plan guidelines respecting building form, landscaping, signage and parking.

A copy of the proposed bylaw(s) and report(s) relevant to this bylaw may be inspected at the Municipal Hall, Monday to Friday, excluding statutory holidays, from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., from Friday, November 11, 2016 to Monday, November 21, 2016. The information is also available on our website at www.mission.ca by searching “upcoming public hearing”.

If you are unable to attend the Public Hearing, you may send a written submission, including your name and address, to the attention of Michael Younie, Corporate Officer, or email info@mission.ca by 4:00 p.m. on the Friday preceding the date of the Public Hearing. All submissions will form part of the record of the Hearing.

If you require additional information, please contact the Development Services Department at (604) 820-3748 or email planning@mission.ca.

Yours truly,

For, Dan Sommer
DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DATE: November 7, 2016  
TO: Mayor and Council  
FROM: Robert Publow, Planner  
SUBJECT: Development applications to facilitate a four (4) urban residential subdivision located at 7765 Horne Street.  
ATTACHMENT(S): Appendix 1 – Information for Corporate Officer  
Appendix 2 – Location Map  
Appendix 3 – Draft Plan of Subdivision  
Appendix 4 - Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan  
Appendix 5 – Engineering Department Comments  
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7765 Horne Street  
APPLICANT: Analytical Consulting  
OCP: This application is in conformance with the current Urban Compact – Multiple Family OCP designation.  
DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE: September 29, 2016  
LOCATION: Mission Core
OVERVIEW AND STAFF COMMENTS

This report details the rezoning, and development permit applications to facilitate a four (4) lot subdivision and identifies the necessary amendments to Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009.

Staff support the proposed Zoning Amending Bylaw and as such have listed the Bylaw 5595-2016-5050(220) under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the Council agenda.

Subject to Council’s approval, a Public Hearing will be scheduled for November 21, 2016.

SUMMARY

An application has been received from Analytical Consulting to subdivide the property located at 7765 Horne Street (Appendix 2). Analytical Consulting is the agent acting on behalf of Douglas Carter, the property owner seeking to rezone the subject property to facilitate a subdivision of the lands into four (4) lots, as shown in draft plan of subdivision attached as Appendix 3. The subdivision would create four (4) lots, of which three (3) are single-family residential lots and one (1) larger remainder lot having further development potential.

PLANNING ANALYSIS

Neighbourhood Characteristics

The proposed development is located in the Mission Core area and is in compliance with the property’s Urban Compact – Multiple Family Official Community Plan (OCP) land use designation.

The subject property is also situated within the Urban Infill Area of Mission and is surrounded predominantly by single-family residential properties. The properties located to the west have been developed to achieve the density envisioned by the OCP, while the properties to the north, south and east currently have potential for redevelopment which could result in a further increase in density in the area.

The existing home on the property would be retained on the large remainder lot (as shown on Appendix 3) fronting Horne Street, while the proposed three new lots would front onto Deerfield Street. In general, the lot configuration fronting Deerfield Street mirrors the development directly west which completed in 2012. A temporary vehicular access from the Deerfield Street cul-de-sac to the home on the larger remainder lot will ultimately be decommissioned and relegated to a utility and service corridor and possibly for a pedestrian connection when this larger lot develops. The existing shed shown on Appendix 3 will be removed prior to completion of the subdivision.

Zoning (Bylaw 5050-2009)

The site is currently zoned Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone. Consistent with the Urban Compact – Multiple Family Residential designation of the property, the applicant proposes to rezone the western portion of the property Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone as shown on Appendix 4 - Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan, to facilitate the creation of three (3) new residential lots.

While one of the proposed lots is at the minimum area requirement of the Zone (465 square metres or 5005 square feet), the two adjacent lots are slightly above the minimum area requirements of the Zone and therefore offer better building envelopes. The remaining eastern portion of the lot is not part of the rezoning and would retain its current R558 Zone. Future development of this area would consider appropriate zoning at that time.
Access
Paved road access is available to the site from the east at Horne Street and from the west at Deerfield Street. As part of this subdivision, the developer is required to construct the remaining portion of the ½ road and cul-de-sac bulb on Deerfield Street as detailed by the Engineering Department comments in Appendix 5. As the existing half cul-de-sac would simply complete the existing road network, a street naming bylaw is not required with this application.

LAN.10 – Panhandle Lot Policy - Urban

As noted, access to the three new residential lots will be off Deerfield Street, a temporary secondary access to the larger remainder lot will be maintained until such time this property develops. While the existing home on the larger lot would maintain primary access from Horne Street, the secondary access from Deerfield Street will be allowed for access to an existing shop/garage on the property.

While panhandle access from Deerfield Street to this larger remainder would not comply with the criteria established within the District’s pan-handle policy (LAN.10), it has been determined that the topography and future servicing needs of the remainder portion of the subject property could result in a situation where future servicing of the remainder lot would be most practical through this corridor.

Therefore, vehicle access over the utility corridor/panhandle will be restricted by way covenant at time of subdivision to facilitate secondary access to the garage on the large remained lot only. With any development beyond one single family dwelling on this remainder parcel, all vehicle access over the utility corridor/panhandle will be terminated with the exception of emergency access.

Servicing
Municipal sanitary service, municipal storm services and municipal water are available at Horne Street and Deerfield Street. Engineered designs of the proposed servicing and road design will be required at time of subdivision.

Environmental Protection
There are no watercourses or environmentally sensitive areas on the subject property. The property is moderately sloped and therefore, at this time, no geotechnical issues are expected to arise.

Tree Retention
In accordance with Council Policy LAN.32 – Tree Retention and Replanting, the applicant will be required to plant a total of eight (8) trees; 2 trees for each of the four (4) lots created. This provision will be met as part of the subdivision approval process.

In addition to this requirement, the applicant is required to replace any significant tree (trees having a caliper of 0.2 metres or greater) that will be removed except within the proposed municipal infrastructure necessary to complete the development.

Parks and Trails
As no parkland has been identified within this site and in accordance with Section 510 of the Local Government Act, the Parks, Recreation and Culture Department is recommending cash-in-lieu for parkland for this development proposal up to 5% of the market value of the land.

Development Permit – Intensive Residential Development Permit Area
A Development Permit for building form and character is required for all intensive residential developments within the urban area. The OCP establishes guidelines for the form and character of intensive residential development by facilitating a higher standard of building design, housing
alternative, site compatibility and site aesthetics that promote a vibrant residential neighbourhood. The applicant is required to register a restrictive covenant stipulating design guidelines as outlined in the OCP that the proposed residential buildings would need to meet.

Approval of Intensive Residential Development Permits are delegated to the Director of Development Services, thus, no approval from Council is required.

While the target zoning for these future compact residential lots would not allow for secondary dwellings, the developer will be requested to register a restrictive covenant on title further prohibiting such uses as secondary dwelling uses on cul-de-sacs lots have proven problematic with respect to limited to no on-street parking. The encumbrance registered on title would inform any prospective purchaser of this restriction and thereby address the notion of a guarantee to construct an unauthorized suite.

COMMUNITY AMENITY CONTRIBUTION (LAN.40 – Financial Contribution for Community Amenities)

In accordance with Council Policy LAN.40, the applicant has volunteered to contribute $8,445 ($2,815 per new lot) to offset the unique financial burden that residential development imposes on the District to fund new or expand facilities and/or amenities, such as park improvements, libraries, and police and fire protection.

COMMUNICATION

The developer has posted a development notification sign on the site summarizing the proposed development. Provided a public hearing date is determined by Council, the sign will be modified to advertise the public hearing details (i.e., date, time and place). In addition, a notice will be mailed to the owners and to the occupiers of all properties within a distance of 152 metres (500 ft.) of the development site notifying them of the public hearing details.

Policy LAN.50 - Pre-Public Hearing Information Packages

A pre-public hearing information package will be prepared to include copies of all applicable documents and will be made available online or at municipal hall for public viewing.

Bylaw 3612-2003 Land Use Application Procedures and Fees

A Notice of Public Hearing will be prepared in accordance with Bylaw 3612-2003 and the Local Government Act.

REFERRALS

Engineering

The Engineering Department has no objection to the project subject to the completion of roadworks requirements as outlined in Appendix 5.

Parks, Recreation and Culture

The Parks, Recreation and Culture Department has no objection to the project and recommends that parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu at time of subdivision.

REQUIREMENT(S) PRIOR TO FINAL READING

The Final Reading of the amending bylaw(s) will be held until the following have been satisfied:
1. The community amenity contribution that has been volunteered in the amount of $8,445 ($2,815 per new unit or lot) is received;
2. Registration or an undertaking to register any applicable encumbrances related to restrictions on access and secondary dwellings;
3. Completion of roadworks as required by the Engineering Department; and
4. Any other requirements resulting from Council's consideration of the Bylaw including Public Hearing.

INFORMATIONAL NOTES
In accordance with Section 510 of the Local Government Act and Council Policy LAN. 26, parkland dedication of five per cent (5%) is applied as cash in lieu to subdivision file S16-016.

SIGN-OFFS

Robert Publow,  Reviewed by:
Planner  Dan Sommer, Director of Development Services

Comment from Chief Administrative Officer

Reviewed
Appendix 1

Information for Corporate Officer

Civic Address: 7765 Horne Street
PID: 004-531-795
Legal: Lot 14 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12578
Appendix 2

Location Map
Appendix 4

Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan

Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

Shaded area to remain Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone
CIVIC ADDRESS: 7765 Horne Street

CURRENT ZONE: R558  PROPOSED ZONE: a portion RC465 and a portion R558

DOMESTIC WATER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal water is available on Horne Street and Deerfield Street. No upgrades are required.

SANITARY SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal sanitary sewer is available on Horne Street and Deerfield Street. No upgrades are required.

STORM SEWER REQUIREMENTS:
Municipal storm sewer is available on Horne Street and Deerfield Street. No upgrades are required.

ROAD WORK REQUIREMENTS:
Horne Street provides paved access to the parent property with R558 zoning. No upgrades are required.
Deerfield Street provides paved access to the proposed RC465 portion of the site. No upgrades are required.
The developer shall construct the remaining portion of the ½ road and cul-de-sac bulb on Deerfield Street at the time of subdivision.

RECOMMENDATION:
From an engineering point of view, the rezoning application may proceed to adoption once the roadwork requirements have been met.

Prepared by:
Jason Anthony, Engineering Technologist

Reviewed by:
Jay Jackman, Manager of Development
Engineering and Projects
The Minutes of the Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting held in the Conference Room of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on Wednesday, August 31, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Councillor Rhett Nicholson, Chair
Ilona Klimczak
Tracy Loffler
Calvin Williams

Members Absent: Maya Bellay
Tamara Bridal
Megan Davies

Others Present: Michael Boronowski, Staff Liaison
Allyssa Fischer, Administrative Clerk

1. CALL TO ORDER
   The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
   Moved and seconded;
   That the agenda of the Young Adult Engagement Committee held on August 31, 2016 be approved.
   CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL
   (a) Moved and seconded;
   That the minutes of the April 27, 2016 meeting of the Young Adult Engagement Committee be approved.
   CARRIED
   (b) Moved and seconded;
   That the minutes of the May 25, 2016 meeting of the Young Adult Engagement Committee be approved.
   CARRIED

4. NEW BUSINESS
   (a) Round-table Updates
   Members of the committee briefly discussed their activities since the last Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting held on June 29, 2016.
(b) Downtown Mission Survey

R. Nicholson informed the committee that he and committee member Maya Bellay had visited downtown Mission businesses in order to help them fill out the YAEC survey on downtown business services. He estimated that they had visited approximately 70% of the downtown businesses. A brief discussion ensued regarding the best way to distribute the survey results and it was determined that further discussion would be required at the next YAEC meeting when Maya would be in attendance.

(c) Governance and Roles

I. Klimczak expressed concerns regarding the lack of detail in the current YAEC Terms of Reference document. She explained that for many young people, the YAEC would be their first experience with a committee, and it would be helpful to have clearly defined processes. The following is a summarized list of what the committee discussed:

- It was decided that the committee will meet no less than ten times per year, on the last Wednesday of the month. No meeting will be held in the months of July or December.
- Discussion ensued regarding voting at committee meetings. It was determined that only in-person votes would count towards resolutions. The committee briefly discussed the chair's ability to throw a casting vote in the event of a tie. It was determined that the committee would follow Robert's Rules of Order for Committees and Boards and that the committee would only go before Mayor and Council to dispute a tie if it was a major issue.
- The committee agreed that either a chair or co-chair needed to be present at a committee meeting in order for the meeting to be considered as having established a quorum.
- It was noted that it may be beneficial for the committee to keep a log of members, identifying when each member joined the committee, their position within the committee, and when they left the committee.
- The committee agreed to add a Social Media section to its Terms of Reference. This section will include who is responsible for overseeing the page as well as which committee members should be added as Administrators on the page. M. Boronowski noted that District staff will maintain records on accounts and profiles managed by the committee, but that it would be the responsibility of the committee to manage the account.
- It was noted that the committee had no co-chairs and that this role was not defined in the YAEC Terms of Reference. The committee members agreed that the discussion of co-chairs and their roles and responsibilities would be deferred to the next Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting on September 28, 2016, when more committee members would be present.

(d) Fall Priority Setting

This item was deferred to the next Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting to be held on September 28, 2016.
5. **NEXT MEETING**

The next Young Adult Engagement Committee meeting will take place on Wednesday, September 28, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved and seconded,
That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED
The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
The Minutes of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held in the Boardroom at the Economic Development Department at B-7337 Welton Street, Mission, BC on Tuesday, September 13, 2016 commencing at 8:01 a.m.

Members Present: Paul Adams, Altentech Power Inc. & Mission Wood Pellet
Rocky Blondin, Blondin Enterprises
Ann Harper, Representative for the Mission Regional Chamber of Commerce (MRCC)
Wade Peary, Riverside College
Dan Schubert, Schubert Plumbing & Heating Ltd.
Beverly Toews, Fraser Pacific Enterprises Inc.
Craig Toews, University of the Fraser Valley (UFV)
Raymond Szabada, Sumas Regional Consortium for High Tech. (SRCTec)

Staff: Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning
Clare Seeley, Executive Assistant for Economic Development

Members Absent: Pia Ritch, Mission Community Skills Centre Society
Cory Padula, DragonAire Cooking Technologies Inc.
Glen Sullivan, FVBS Rona
Ron Poole, Chief Administration Officer

1. CALL TO ORDER

Stacey Crawford called the meeting to order.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Wade Perry and seconded by Ann Harper
That the agenda of the Economic Development Select Committee meeting held on September 13, 2016 be approved as circulated.
CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved and seconded,
That the minutes of the July 12, 2016 meeting of the Economic Development Select Committee be approved.
CARRIED
4. **NEW BUSINESS**

(a) **Official Community Plan and Major Projects update**

2016 year-to-date has seen 108 development inquiry applications and 70 formal applications submitted.

Council approved funding for $3.5 million for the Downtown Streetscape Improvements Project.

The District is looking to extend the Downtown Façade Improvements Program.

The Official Community Plan draft is being prepared for staff review, which will then be presented to Council.

**Action Item:** G. MacKay to forward the Streetscape Plan to the committee.

(b) **EDSC Survey Results**

EDSC members completed the survey, staff did not participate.

Not all questions were responded to which created numerical differences, this did not have a material effect on the emerging themes.

This process is to create the vision and corresponding strategies for economic development in Mission, the outcomes of which will be presented to council for consideration on October 24, 2016.

All answers were reviewed by the committee, with agreed changes noted in the EDSC Aggregate Survey Responses document.

**Action:** R. Blondin to facilitate summation of top themes

**Action:** S. Crawford to determine potential dates for an EDSC meeting prior to the presentation to Council.

(c) **Selection of Committee Appointments for EDSC**

There were two nominations for both positions of Chair and Vice-Chair.

The committee appointed Rocky Blondin as Chair and Glen Sullivan as Vice-Chair.

5. **NEXT MEETING**

Special EDSC Meeting - date to be scheduled.

Joint EDSC Meeting with Council – Monday, October 24, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

EDSC Regular Meeting – Tuesday, November 8, 2016 at 8:00 a.m.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Stacey Crawford

That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 09:48 a.m.
The Minutes of the Cultural Resources Commission meeting held in the Conference Room at the Mission Leisure Centre, 7650 Grand St, Mission BC on Friday, November 4, 2016 commencing at 5:15 p.m.

Members Present:  Chair V. Billesberger  
Vice Chair J. Priestley  
P. Alexis (Council Liaison)  
S. Key, Deputy Director, Parks, Recreation & Culture  
M. Gauthier  
S. Grass  
L. Nessim

Members Absent:  M. Knight  
C. Lauzé  
D. Marshall

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by V. Billesbeger, all in favour

1. That the agenda of the November 4, 2016 meeting be amended and approved to include discussion of the Public Art Inventory under New Business [5(c)].

CARRIED

3. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by L. Nessim, seconded by J. Priestley

1. That the minutes of the October 14, 2016 meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission be approved.

CARRIED

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES

(a) Muse Awards follow up

- V. Billesberger, L. Nessim and S. Key will plan to meet in January, 2017 with N. Arcand, Executive Director of the Mission Arts Council (MAC) and the Board with the purpose of exploring options for their involvement in hosting the awards in the future. The task group will report back the CRC.

Action Item: MUSE Award Task Group will plan meeting with MAC.
(b) Culture Days report

- Written report prepared by Sue Grass on behalf of the 2016 Culture Days Task Group was presented.

- Starting in January, 2017, the Culture Days Task Group will contact individuals and organizations to gauge participation in Culture Days 2017, including the creation of a 2017 event list and connection with the Mission 125th and Canada 150th anniversaries.

- V. Billesberger recommended placing Culture Days as a regular item on future CRC agendas.

(c) 2017 New Members

- The application for new members for the CRC is available on the District and the CRC websites. The call was also advertised in the Mission Record on November 4th and will continue in the November 11 and 18 editions. CRC members are encouraged to spread the word to potential members in the community.

- November 21st is the deadline for applications.

**Action Item:** Call for new members will be further promoted on social media.

(d) Management Plan review: continuing comments

i. **Scan of Goals and Objectives (Goal 6)**

- Re: 6(b) CRC supports a review of a municipal cultural centre to be included as part of the 2017 Parks, Recreation & Culture Master Plan process.

- Re: 6(d) The MNet Radio Music Festival in Centennial Park in August was a new event for the park that also utilized the District’s portable stage and had a good turnout for a first time event.

- Re: 6(e) No new facilities have been built since the last review. There is a possibility of a Seniors/Youth facility in the coming years which would be applicable to this task.

**Action Item:** CRC members will review Goals 7 & 8 in 2017.
5. **NEW BUSINESS**

(a) 2017 District of Mission Anniversary

i. **Steering Committee update**

- The Steering Committee is working through concepts and ideas for Mission’s 125th Anniversary celebration, including a season of celebration to be kicked off with events on June 2, 2017 and wrapping up on the Culture Days weekend, Sept 29 – Oct 1, 2017.

- CRC event suggestions include a singing event (700 person chorus) at the Clarke Theatre facilitated by local choirs; an Arts & Culture Hall of Fame (possibly virtual) that honours the arts and culture sector of our community. The choir idea will be presented to the Steering Committee and a CRC Task Group will explore Hall of Fame concepts which will be presented to Council for consideration. It was suggested that the Hall of Fame Task Group meet with Councillor Stevens who proposed the idea.

**Action Item:** A Hall of Fame Task Group will be formed in January.

ii. **Heritage Week (February 13-19, 2017)**

- V. Billesberger is supplying Mission Secondary art class with historic photographs which students will use as inspiration to create a Heritage Week display celebrating the 125th Anniversary. Other schools (art and photography) will be contacted to see if the teachers and students would be interested in participating through art projects or photographing of events throughout the year.

- P. Alexis announced that a delegation from Japan, including the Mayor of Oyama, will be visiting Mission in late June/early July and is interested in the history and heritage of Japanese citizens in Mission. V. Billesberger had previously helped create an extensive body of work on this subject through the Archives, so will draw on the content to create a presentation during the visit.

(b) **Proposed Young Artists Grant Program report**

- A written report prepared by V. Billesberger on behalf of the Young Arts & Culture Grant Program Task Group was presented. The ArtsStarts program, with its goal to inspire young artists and create opportunities, is a highly successful model, but is centered in Vancouver. The MAC Ignite program is also an excellent way to engage young artists and musicians, but the program focuses on one-on-one mentorship, so the Task Group believes there is room for further programs to be developed in Mission.

- The CRC is interested in further investigating grant opportunities for Mission’s young and emerging artists, and finding ways for individuals and organizations to provide funding for art programs.

**Action Item:** CRC will consider this work when setting priorities for 2017.
(c) Public Art Inventory

- M. Gauthier was asked to create an accessible (art accessible 24/7) list from the current list of public art in Mission and send to V. Billesberger before December, 15, 2016. It is hoped that this can be included in the presentation to Council on December 19, 2016.

- The Mission Chamber of Commerce will be presenting the Tourism Strategy work to Council in November. The Arts and Culture sector, including public art, is listed as an important aspect of the strategy. V. Billesberger showed an example of the Tourism Abbotsford Arts & Culture brochure to highlight one way to promote this aspect of the community.

- P. Alexis asked that another call for applications or another approach be considered for the 2014 BC Winter Games Arts Legacy Grand Fund. S. Key will revisit the project to determine the best course of action.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

The next meeting will be on Friday Dec 9, 2016 at 5:15 pm at the home of L. Nessim (a brief meeting of the CRC, followed by appetizers).
WHEREAS, under the provisions of the *Local Government Act*, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5608-2016-5050(223)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) rezoning the properties located at 8473 and 8511 Judith Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 005-468-159
      Lot 58 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 56771

      Parcel Identifier: 000-859-532
      Lot 59 Section 28 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 56771

      from Suburban 36 (S36) Zone to Urban Residential 465 (R465) Zone; and

   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this __ day of ___, 2016
READ A SECOND TIME this __ day of ___, 2016
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2016
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2016
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2016

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5611-2016

A Bylaw to name streets within the District of Mission

WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Charter, may assign the name of any highway;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable to name certain streets within the Municipality;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Street Naming (Adair Avenue, Ewert Avenue Extension, George Street, Jack Crescent) Bylaw 5611-2016".

2. That four new roads over portions of property located at 8455 and 8502 McTaggart Street and legally described as:
   - Parcel Identifier: 016-788-648
     Lot 2 Section 25 and 26 Township 17 and District Lot 476 Group 1 New Westminster District Plan 87417
   - Parcel Identifier: 009-747-532
     Lot A District Lot 476 Group 1 and Section 25 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12639

be named as follows:
   - a) **Adair Avenue** running generally east-west and connecting to McTaggart Street at the west end;
   - b) **Ewert Avenue (extension)** extending west from the east end of Ewert Avenue;
   - c) **George Street** running generally north-south, terminating at Adair Avenue to the north and Ewert Avenue to the south; and
   - d) **Jack Crescent** running generally north-south and connecting to McTaggart Street at the east end;

as shown on Schedule “A” attached to and forming part of this Bylaw.

READ A FIRST TIME this ___ day of ____, 2016

READ A SECOND TIME this ___ day of ___, 2016

READ A THIRD TIME this ___ day of ___, 2016

ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2016

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5595-2016-5050(220)

A Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5595-2016-5050(220)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:
   a) rezoning the western portion of the property located at 7765 Horne Street and legally described as:
      Parcel Identifier: 004-531-795
      Lot 14 Section 21 Township 17 New Westminster District Plan 12578
      as shown by the cross-hatched area on the Zoning Amending Bylaw Reference Plan attached to and forming part of this Bylaw, from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone; and
   b) amending the zoning maps accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 7th day of November, 2016
READ A SECOND TIME this 7th day of November, 2016
PUBLIC HEARING held this __ day of ___, 2016
READ A THIRD TIME this __ day of ___, 2016
ADOPTED this __ day of ___, 2016

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
Legend

Cross Hatched area to be rezoned from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone

Shaded area to remain Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone
DISTRICT OF MISSION

BYLAW 5586-2016-5050(213)

Bylaw to amend "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009"

WHEREAS, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, a Council may, by bylaw, divide the municipality into zones and regulate the use of land, buildings and structures within such zones;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission has adopted "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" and amended same from time to time;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the District of Mission deems it advisable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the District of Mission, in open meeting assembled, ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Bylaw may be cited for all purposes as "District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5586-2016-5050(213)."

2. "District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009" as amended, is hereby further amended by:

   a) Adding the following definitions to Section 102 (Definitions):
      i. **Tobacconist** means the sale of tobacco and tobacco products including e-cigarettes (a device used to simulate the experience of smoking, having a cartridge with a heater that vaporizes liquid nicotine instead of burning tobacco).
      ii. **Cheque Cashing and Payday Loans** means an unchartered loaning facility which offers a relatively small amount of money to be lent at a high rate of interest on the agreement that it will be repaid when the borrower receives their next paycheck.
      iii. **Marihuana Sales** means the sale of marihuana, medical marihuana and marihuana products, and includes the sale of drug paraphernalia such as bongs, hookah pipes, glass pipes, and other smoking aids.
      iv. **Craft Brewery** means a brewery that produces small amounts of beer, typically much smaller than large-scale corporate breweries, and is independently owned typically characterized by their emphasis on quality, flavour and brewing technique.

   b) Removing the following uses from Section 901, Part B (Core Commercial Downtown One (CCD1) Zone, Permitted Uses):
      i. Vehicle Rental
      ii. Arcade
      iii. Body Art and Tattoo Parlour
      iv. Flea Market
c) Adding the following uses to Section 804, Part B (Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone and Commercial Highway 2 (CH2) Zone, Permitted Uses), with a notation that these uses are not permitted within 100 meters of a property zoned Core Commercial Downtown One (CCD1):
   i. Tobacconist
   ii. Cheque Cashing and Payday Loans

d) Adding Craft Brewery as a permitted use to Section 901, Part B (Core Commercial Downtown One (CCD1) Zone, Permitted Uses).

e) Adding Marihuana Sales as a prohibited use to Section 106, Part C (Use Regulations, Uses Prohibited).

f) Amending Section 106, Part D (Use Regulations, Use Categories) accordingly.

READ A FIRST TIME this 3rd day of October, 2016
READ A SECOND TIME this 3rd day of October, 2016
PUBLIC HEARING held this 7th day of November, 2016
READ A THIRD TIME this 7th day of November, 2016
APPROVED by the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure this 15th day of November, 2016
ADOPTED this ___ day of ___, 2016

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR  MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER
DISTRICT OF MISSION
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT DPM16-029

Issued to: Mission Valley Shopping Centre Ltd., Inc No 499366
(Owner as defined in the Local Government Act, hereinafter referred to as the Permittee)

Address: 14th Floor, 355 Burrard Street, Vancouver, BC V6C 2G6

1. This Development Permit is issued subject to compliance with all of the Bylaws of the Municipality applicable thereto, except as specifically varied or supplemented by this permit.

2. This Development Permit applies to and only to those lands within the Municipality legally described below, and any and all buildings, structures and development thereon:

   Parcel Identifier: 024-998-991
   Lot 1 District Lot 165 Group 3 New Westminster District Plan LMP49493

3. The above property has been designated as Development Permit Area D – Lougheed Highway Corridor Area Development Permit Area in the Official Community Plan.

   The said lands are zoned Commercial Highway Two Zone (CH2) pursuant to “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009” as amended.

   “District of Mission Zoning Bylaw” as amended is hereby supplemented in respect of the said lands as follows:

   Building design, siting and landscaping plans to be as shown on Drawings Numbered A2.0 and A2.1 inclusive, which are attached hereto and form part of this permit.

   Minor changes to the aforesaid drawings that do not affect the intent of this Development Permit and the general appearance of the buildings and character of the development may be permitted, subject to the approval of the Municipality.

4. The following applies:

   (a) The said lands shall not be built on and no building shall be constructed, installed or erected on the subject property, unless the building is constructed, installed or erected substantially in accordance with development plans numbered A2.0 and A2.1 inclusive, prepared by Lovick Scott Architects Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as “the plans”), unless approval in writing has been obtained from the Municipality to deviate from the said development plan.

5. The land described herein shall be developed strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and provisions of this permit and any plans and specifications attached to this permit shall form a part hereof.

6. This permit shall lapse if the Permittee does not substantially commence the construction of the first phase of a phased development permitted by this permit within two (2) years of the date of this permit.

7. The terms of this permit or any amendment to it, are binding on all persons who acquire an interest in the land affected by this permit.

8. This permit is not a building permit.
AUTHORIZED RESOLUTION NO. [Click here to type resolution number] passed by the Council on the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month], [Click here to type year].

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this Development Permit is hereby issued by the Municipality signed by the Mayor and Corporate Officer the [Click here to type day of the month] day of [Click here to type month], [Click here to type year].

____________________________
Randy Hawes,
MAYOR

____________________________
Mike Younie
CORPORATE OFFICER

Development Permit DPM16-029
MINUTES of the REGULAR MEETING of the COUNCIL of the DISTRICT OF MISSION held in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Hall, 8645 Stave Lake Street, Mission, British Columbia, on November 7, 2016 commenced at 1:00 p.m. for COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, and was immediately followed by a CLOSED MEETING of Council, and reconvened at 7:00 p.m. for REGULAR COUNCIL proceedings.

Council Members Present:  Mayor Randy Hawes
                           Councillor Pam Alexis
                           Councillor Carol Hamilton
                           Councillor Jim Hinds
                           Councillor Rhett Nicholson
                           Councillor Danny Plecas
                           Councillor Jenny Stevens

Staff Members Present:  Ron Poole, Chief Administrative Officer
                       Mike Younie, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
                       Kris Boland, Manager of Finance
                       Michael Boronowski, Manager of Civic Engagement and Corporate Initiatives
                       Stacey Crawford, Economic Development Officer
                       *Ted De Jager, Officer in Charge, Mission RCMP Detachment
                       *Heather Gherman, Manager of Human Resources
                       Kirsten Hargreaves, Manager of Social Development
                       Dave Heyes, Manager of Forestry Business
                       Jennifer Hill, Administrative Assistant
                       Jay Jackman, Manager of Assets, Infrastructure and Projects
                       Tracy Kyle, Director of Engineering and Public Works
                       Gina MacKay, Manager of Long Range Planning and Special Projects
                       Scott Ross, Manager of Accounting Services
                       Jennifer Russell, Deputy Corporate Officer
                       Brent Schmitt, Manager of Business Services
                       Maureen Sinclair, Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture
                       Dale Unrau, Fire Chief
                       *Present for a portion of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER  
   Mayor Hawes called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
   Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Plecas, and
   RESOLVED: That the agenda for the regular Council meeting of November 7, 2016 be adopted.
   CARRIED

3. RESOLUTION TO RESOLVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
   Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and
   RESOLVED: That Council now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.
   CARRIED
4. CORPORATE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

Councillor Alexis assumed the Chair.

**Investment Holdings Quarterly Report – September 30, 2016**

A report from the Manager of Accounting Services dated November 7, 2016 regarding the District’s cash and portfolio investment holdings was provided for the Committee’s information.

**Safety Management System**

A report from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated November 7, 2016 regarding the development and rollout of the District’s new Safety Management System (SMS) was provided for the Committee’s information. Ilona Klimczak, Health & Safety Director of Coast Eagle Consulting Inc., gave a presentation as to the current status of the District’s Safety Management System.

The Committee recognized the benefits of an organized approach to safety and were advised that the Human Resources Department will compile and provide to Council information in regards to health and safety costs, claims and missed work days.

**Changes to TrainBus Service**

A report from the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer dated November 7, 2016 regarding upcoming changes to the TrainBus service component of the West Coast Express was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Discussion ensued around the current need for expanded bus service in Mission to facilitate growth, the cost and possible saving opportunities, short-term and long-term plans, the current contract with Translink, and the most convenient model and schedule for the riders.

Staff were directed to speak with BC Transit and Translink in regards to cost sharing, to look into the feasibility of hiring a private service, and to survey TrainBus riders for their preferred hours of service.

5. ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Councillor Hinds assumed the Chair.

**Water Meter Pilot Study Update**

A report from the Manager of Business Services dated November 7, 2016 summarizing the results of the Water Meter Pilot Study was provided for the Committee’s information. The consultant, Karl Filiatrault, gave an overview of the findings in his report which included consumption data and the potential for reduction in water usage.

The Committee discussed costs, possible reasons for higher than average consumption which could include leaks, a voluntary metered water program for properties with secondary suites, a more regular billing cycle to increase customer awareness, and incentive programs. Staff advised they will continue to collect data and present additional options in their next report to Council.
1st Avenue Streetscape Improvements

A report from the Manager of Development Engineering and Projects dated November 7, 2016 summarizing the Project Plan for the 1st Avenue Improvements Project was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the 1st Avenue Streetscape Improvements Project Plan, as summarized in the report from the Manager of Development Engineering & Projects dated November 7, 2016, be endorsed;

2. That staff be authorized to engage the market for qualified consulting services for the purpose of procuring a for tender engineered design package in 2017; and

3. That staff be authorized to commence of sub-surface municipal utility repairs, as necessary, starting in 2017.

CARRIED

2017 Asset Management Planning Program Grant Application

A report from the Engineering Technologist II dated November 7, 2016 requesting support for the submission of a grant application for the Level of Service Framework Project was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Level of Service Framework Project be supported for the 2017 Asset Management Planning Program grant application, as outlined in the Engineering Technologist II – Asset Management report dated November 7, 2016;

2. That, if the grant application is successful, the 2017 capital budget for the Asset Management System be increased from $30,000 to $40,000 to include the $10,000 grant funding; and

3. The District’s financial plan be amended accordingly.

CARRIED

6. DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Councillor Nicholson assumed the Chair.

Submission of Context Study to Council from Mission Community Heritage Commission

A report from the Senior Planner dated November 7, 2016 presenting the Mission Community Heritage Commission’s Context Study was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Mayor Hawes, and

RECOMMENDED:

That District of Mission Context Study 2016, as appended to the Senior Planner’s report dated November 7, 2016 be received.

CARRIED
Liquor Licensing

A report from the Manager of Long Range Planning dated November 7, 2016 regarding recent and pending changes to the Provincial Liquor Control and Licensing Regulations was provided for the Committee’s information.

Discussion ensued regarding provincial liquor licensing regulations and the status of the Save On Foods application to sell VQA wines in its store.

Moved by Mayor Hawes, and

RECOMMENDED:

That staff prepare a zoning amending bylaw for Council’s consideration stating that the sale of alcohol within one kilometer of existing alcohol retailers be limited to VQA wines.

OPPOSED: Councillor Alexis
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Nicholson
Councillor Plecas
Councillor Stevens

DEFEATED

Development applications to facilitate a four (4) urban residential subdivision located at 7765 Horne Street

A report from the Planner dated November 7, 2016 detailing the rezoning and development permit applications to facilitate a four lot subdivision located at 7765 Horne Street was provided for the Committee’s information. Staff support the proposed zoning amendment and as such, have listed the Zoning Amending Bylaw under the “Bylaws for Consideration” section of the agenda.

The Committee discussed the replanting of trees, servicing corridor and concerns of storm water runoff due to the steep topography of the land.

7. PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURE

Councillor Hamilton assumed the Chair.

Developer’s Request to Waive 5% Cash in Lieu for Parkland for S13-008 at 8973 Manzer Street

A report from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Culture dated November 7, 2016 regarding the request to waive the requirement for cash in lieu contribution for parkland for the development at 8973 Manzer Street was provided for the Committee’s consideration.

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, and

RECOMMENDED:

1. That the July 18th, 2016 resolution of Council (R16.408) requiring the payment of 5% of the value of the land as cash in lieu of parkland for subdivision S08-13 located at 8973 Manzer be maintained; and

2. That the District of Mission not accept any additional portion of lands or rights-of-way for trails beyond what was identified for dedication in the Preliminary Layout Approval letter dated June 6, 2014 for subdivision S13-008.

OPPOSED: Mayor Hawes

CARRIED
8. RESOLUTION TO RISE FROM COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mayor Hawes resumed the Chair.

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That Council rise from Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

9. RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE PUBLIC, RECESS THE PUBLIC MEETING UNTIL 7:00 P.M. AND IMMEDIATELY CONVENE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Moved by Councillor Alexis, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED:

1. That pursuant to Section 90 of the Community Charter, the public be excluded from this portion of the meeting as the subject matter being considered relates to the following:
   - Section 90(1)(e) of the Community Charter – the acquisition, disposition or expropriation of land or improvements, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality;
   - Section 90(1)(f) of the Community Charter – law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment;
   - Section 90(2)(b) of the Community Charter – the consideration of information received and held in confidence relating to negotiations between the municipality and a provincial government or the federal government or both, or between a provincial government or the federal government or both and a third party;

2. That the public portion of the meeting be recessed until 7:00 p.m.; and

3. That Council immediately resolve into the closed portion of their meeting.

CARRIED

The meeting recessed at 3:59 p.m.

10. RECONVENE

Mayor Hawes reconvened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Randy Hawes
Councillor Pam Alexis
Councillor Carol Hamilton
Councillor Jim Hinds
Councillor Rhett Nicholson
Councillor Danny Plecas

Council Members Absent: Councillor Jenny Stevens
11. RESOLUTION TO ADOPT RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Nicholson, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the November 7, 2016 Committee of the Whole, as contained in items RC16/595 to RC16/599, be adopted.

CARRIED

RC16/605
NOV. 07/16

Moved by Councillor Hamilton, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the November 7, 2016 Committee of the Whole, as contained in item RC16/600 (Developer’s Request to Waive 5% Cash in Lieu for Parkland for S13-008 at 8973 Manzer Street) be adopted.

OPPOSED: Mayor Hawes

CARRIED

RC16/606
NOV. 07/16

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the October 20, 2016 Freestanding Committee of the Whole (Corporate Administration and Finance – Budget) report, as contained in items COW16/060 to COW16/064 be adopted.

CARRIED
12. PUBLIC BUDGET CONSULTATION

The Deputy Treasurer/Collector presented a slideshow overview of the draft 2017 proposed budget, including:

- A 3.7% increase in property taxes;
- A 1% increase in water user rates;
- A 4% increase in sewer user rates;
- A 4.9% increase in drainage levy;
- No increase in curbside pick-up of garbage and recycling/compost user rates;
- The budget priorities:
  - Improve public safety
  - Effective economic development in the community
  - Excel in financial management and planning for the future;
- Consolidated operating expenditures of $69.2 million;
- Key budget drivers totaling $408,105 to maintain existing services;
- Service enhancements totalling $647,932;
- A proposed budget increase of $1,056,037;
- A one-time spending initiative totalling $47,000 (which has no property tax impact);
- The impact on the average assessed value home of $66.61;
- A tax notice breakdown;
- How Mission compares in 2016 with neighbouring communities (4th lowest of 22 communities in terms of property taxes);
- The forestry enterprise update;
- The capital plan;
- Reserve Transfers;
- Outstanding debt vs. the borrowing limit;
- Utility operations including the water fund, sewer fund, waste management, flat rate user fees, and drainage utility fund;
- The budget survey; and
- Encouragement to the public to provide feedback.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for comments.

There were no comments or questions from the public.

13. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Zoning Amending Bylaw 5586-2016-5050(213)

A bylaw to permit and prohibit certain uses in the Core Commercial Downtown 1 (CCD1) Zone

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to amend Zoning Bylaw 5050-2009 by:

- Including the definitions of Tobacconist, Cheque Cashing and Payday Loans, Marihuana Sales, and Craft Brewery into Section 102
- Removing the following uses within the Core Commercial Downtown One (CCD1) Zone:
  - Vehicle Rental
  - Arcade
  - Body Art and Tattoo Parlour
  - Flea Market
• Allowing the following uses within the Commercial Highway One (CH1) Zone and the Commercial Highway Two (CH2) Zone with a special notation that neither of these uses are permitted within 100 metres of a property zoned CCD1:
  o Tobacconist
  o Cheque Cashing and Payday Loans

Further amendments include adding Craft Brewery to the permitted uses in the CCD1 Zone and prohibiting the sale of marihuana in the District.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Gina McKay, Manager of Long Range Planning, gave a presentation that provided an outline of the proposed amendment and some history of the Mission Downtown Action Plan.

The Deputy Chief Administrative Officer stated that the following correspondence pertaining to the subject application had been received:

1. Letter dated October 11, 2016 from Lyndon Balisky of the Mission Downtown Business Association in favour of the proposed changes to the bylaw to prohibit certain business uses in Core Commercial Downtown 1 Zone.

2. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Shannon Lester expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

3. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Juanita Feser expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

4. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Herta Hiebert and Tenny Gasparetto expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

5. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Alana Walker expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

6. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Donald Patterson expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

7. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Christa Newman expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

8. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Liz Romano expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

9. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Dave and Victoria Smith expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

10. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Rick and Delyse Heck expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

11. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Sheryl Rankel expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

12. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Judy Kerekes expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop.

13. Email dated November 6, 2016 from Olisa Chornick expressing support for a business licence to be issued to Joe Kerekes for ‘Decadent Ink’ tattoo shop, and supporting a ban on cheque cashing and payday loan shops.
The Mayor advised Joe Kerekes’ tattoo shop will be exempt (grandfathered) from the proposed changes to the bylaw and therefore, will be issued a business licence. The tattoo shop would then become a legal non-conforming business within the District of Mission.

The Mayor opened the floor to the public for questions and comments at 7:33 p.m.

Dr. Lyndon Balisky, President of the Mission Downtown Business Association, expressed his appreciation for Council’s involvement in the downtown area to try to move it in a positive direction.

Diane, an employee at the ‘Weeds Glass and Gifts’ shop in downtown Mission presented a petition in support of their store. She advised they have obtained 131 signatures on the petition since October 14, 2016.

Hearing no further questions or comments, the Mayor declared the Public Hearing for District of Mission Zoning Amending Bylaw 5586-2016-5050(213) closed.

14. COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be received as information:

(a) Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting – September 13, 2016

(b) Cultural Resources Commission Meeting – October 14, 2016

CARRIED

15. BYLAWS FOR CONSIDERATION

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED:

1. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5595-2016-5050(220) R16-017 (Analytical Consulting) – a bylaw to rezone a portion of the property at 7765 Horne Street from Urban Residential 558 (R558) Zone to Residential Compact 465 (RC465) Zone, be **read a first and second time**.

2. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5586-2016-5050(213), a bylaw to permit and prohibit certain uses in the Core Commercial Downtown 1 (CCD1) Zone, be **read a third time**.

3. That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5592-2016-5050(218) R16-035 (Woods) – a bylaw to rezone the property at 12411 Carr Street from Rural Residential 7 (RR7) Zone to Rural Residential 7 Secondary Dwelling (RR7s) Zone, be **adopted**.

CARRIED

Moved by Councillor Hinds, seconded by Mayor Hawes, and

RESOLVED:  That Zoning Amending Bylaw 5609-2016-5050(224), a bylaw to amend the definition of ‘Supermarket’ to specifically exclude the sale of liquor, be **read a first and second time**.

OPPOSED: Councillor Alexis
Councillor Hamilton
Councillor Plecas

DEFEATED
16. COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Moved by Councillor Nicholson, seconded by Councillor Hamilton, and

RESOLVED: That the following minutes be adopted:

(a) Special Council Meeting (Administrative Hearing) – March 14 and September 12, 2016
(b) Regular Council Meeting – October 17, 2016
(c) Freestanding Committee of the Whole (Corporate Services and Finance – Budget) Meeting – October 20, 2016
(d) Special Council Meeting (Economic Development Select Committee) – October 24, 2016
(e) Special Council Meeting (for the purpose of going into a closed meeting) – October 26, 2016

CARRIED

17. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

There was no new/other business.

18. NOTICES OF MOTION

There were no notices of motion.

19. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions from the public.

20. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Plecas, seconded by Councillor Alexis, and

RESOLVED: That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

RANDY HAWES, MAYOR
MIKE YOUNIE, CORPORATE OFFICER