SALT SPRING ISLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Notice of Meeting on Monday, October 29, 2018 at 4:10 PM
SSI Public Library, 129 McPhillips Ave, Salt Spring Island, BC

Wayne McIntyre    Robin Williams    Dal Brickenden    Shellie Barrett
Rhonan Heitzmann    Myna Lee Johnstone

(r) Regrets

AGENDA

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Adoption of Minutes of September 24, 2018

3. Delegation/Presentation
   3.1 Myrna Moore, BC Transit Senior Manager, Government Relations
       2017/2018 Annual Performance Summary

4. Director, Chair and Commissioner Reports

5. Outstanding Business
   5.1 Road Priority Improvements – Dukes Road
   5.2 North Ganges Transportation Plan- Archeological Update
   5.3 Parking Study Update

6. New Business
   6.1 2019 Capital and Operating Budget
       That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission:

       1. Recommend that the Electoral Area Services Committee approve the
          2019 operating and capital budget as presented and recommend that
          the 2018 actual surplus or deficit be balanced on the 2018 transfers
          to the capital reserve funds; and

       2. Recommend that the Electoral Area Services Committee recommend
          that the CRD Board approve the 2019 operating and capital budget
          and the five year financial plan for the Salt Spring Island Community
          Transit and Transportation Service as presented.

   6.2 Islands Trust Referral Rezone Bylaw 515: Gulf Islands Seniors
       Residents Associations-154 Kings Lane
       That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission recommend approval
       of Bylaw 515 subject to conditions outlined below:
       Installation of a pedestrian crosswalk at the east leg of Lower Ganges Road
       and Blain Road intersection which is signed, marked an includes a pedestrian
       push-button activation.
7. Next Meeting: November 26, 2018 at 4:10 pm at the Library

8. Adjournment
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission
Held September 24, 2018 SSI Public Library, 129 McPhillips Ave, Salt Spring Island, BC

Present:  
CRD Director: Wayne McIntyre  
Commission Members: Robin Williams, Shellie Barrett, Dal Brickenden, Rhonan Heitzmann  
Staff: Dan Ovington, Acting Senior Manager, Salt Spring Island Electoral Area; Tracey Shaver, Recording Secretary.

Absent:

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm with a brief self-introduction from recently appointed Commissioner Heitzmann.

1. Approval of Agenda

MOVED by Commissioner Barrett, SECONDED by Commissioner Heitzmann, That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission agenda of September 24, 2018 be amended and approved by adding a delegation under item 3.2 Island Pathways.  
CARRIED

2. Adoption of Minutes of June 25, 2018

MOVED by Commissioner Barrett, SECONDED by Commissioner Brickenden, That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission Minutes of June 25, 2018 be approved.  
CARRIED

3. Delegation/Presentation

3.1 Krumbach Bus Shelters- Robin Williams

Chair Williams briefly described his recent trip to Austria and a small town with unique bus stops obtained through a global contest. Due to equipment failure, pictures of the shelters were unavailable at the meeting.

Chair Williams is proposing establishment of a twin city with the association being our unique transit system and their unique bus shelters.

Item to be brought forward to next meeting.

3.2 Island Pathways

Mr. McLennan presented information on plans to complete an interpretive signage project along the Ganges Village Pathway Network.
• Funding source Heritage BC Grant
• Metal stands designed and fabricated locally
• Proposed locations: Okano Creek on Atkins Rd, graveyard along Lower Ganges Rd, Framer’s Institute for Brittencourt Museum, estuary area along Fulford Ganges Rd

4. Director, Chair and Commissioner Reports

4.1 Director McIntyre briefly reported on the following:
• Bike Park opening
• SSI Water Protection Alliance strategic planning
• Grant in Aid award to marine search and rescue for beacons
• Destination Marketing and Management Organization approved for Salt Spring Island and the Southern Gulf Islands- implement a hotel tax to support marketing of the islands in the off season.
• Ganges Sewer project; on time and budget
• Library Board meetings
• Town hall housing meeting with Adam Olson
• CRD supports 2019 budgets
• Presentation on the use of biochar for reforestation

4.2 Commissioner Brickenden briefly reported on bus shelter project:
• No new submissions over the summer
• Several designs already exist
• Considering merits of opening competition to off island for potential collaboration with architecture firms or schools
• Holding off for input from new CRD director

4.3 Chair Williams briefly discussed the following:
• Items for follow up with CRD CAO; letter to Commission and Regional Parks
• Parking study underway
• Meeting with MoTI – roadlines unfortunate and will be fixed, interested in coordinating Ganges Hill and Drake Road intersection improvement projects, repair costs for Walkers Hook and Isabella Point Road over 2 million.
• Myrna Lee Johnston recommended for approval to the CRD Board for appointment to the Commission

Commissioner Heitzmann questioned road work priorities in relation to the top of Dukes road. To be brought forward to next meeting.

5. Outstanding Business

5.1 Drake Road Priority Improvements and Emergency Access

This item relates to a delegation request from Dragonfly Commons to improve Drake Road. The Chair advised that MoTI will be coordinating with CRD on intersection improvements and any potential works relating to development. Consideration should be given to coordination with any expansion of Ganges Sewer in the Drake Road area.
5.2 I WAV Croftonbrook Housing Project-Request for Route 1 Expansion
This item relates to several delegations and or presentations requesting the extension of Route 1 to provide service for senior residents in anticipation that the proposed affordable housing and the end of Corbett Road is developed.
- CRD staff have requested that BC Transit consider this request when making adjustments to Route 1.
- Route 1 already provides service to an area densely populated by seniors and is the lowest performing.
- The Chair advised that service review and growth planning will take place later this year.
- I WAV has requested that the service change be coordinated to start in the fall of 2019.

5.3 Walkers Hook Route Ridership
Staff queried BC Transit to see if the changes made early this year to accommodate the road closure around Walkers Hook had an impact on ridership. Transit staff responded that the route continues to see a lower ridership of about 4 to 5 per day.

5.4 NGTP Status Update
- Archeological work being completed with permits anticipated to be in place by end of October.
- Construction tender to be released in November for an early 2019 start.

5.5 Booth Canal to Vesuvius Bay Road Pathway Status Update
- Engineering design RFP will be reviewed next week.
- Preliminary budget has engineering technician in place.

6. New Business
6.1 Islands Trust Referral-Bylaw 510 & 511 re: 155 Rainbow Road
- Rezoning will increase value of property
- OCP identifies sidewalks as amenities
- Previous properties along Rainbow Rd have contributed to fund for future development of sidewalks.

MOVED by Commissioner Heitzmann, SECONDED by Director McIntyre,
That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission recommends approval of bylaw 510 and 511 subject to the condition that the property owner provide a sum of money to the Capital Regional District equivalent to the cost of a sidewalk fronting both properties to be held in trust until such time that the community can develop the area.

CARRIED
6.2 BC Transit Monthly Revenue Report
Up $5,000 to date over last year; report received for information.

6.3 Interpretive Signage – Island Pathways Project
Commission is in support of project.

MOVED by Commissioner Brickenden, SECONDED by Commissioner Heitzmann,
That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission is in support of the Island Pathways Heritage BC Interpretive Sign program and the placement of kiosks on Ministry of Transportation lands pending permit approval.

CARRIED

7. Next Meeting: October 29, 2018 at 4:10 pm at the Library

8. Adjournment

MOVED By Director McIntyre, SECONDED by Commissioner Brickenden,
That the meeting adjourn at 5:12 pm.

CARRIED

______________________________  
CHAIR

______________________________  
SENIOR MANAGER
Agenda

- Transit Service Outcomes
- Transit Improvement Proposals
# Transit Service Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Investment Measures</th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue service hours (000)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost ($000)</td>
<td>$668</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>$688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return on Investment</th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips (000)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue ($000)</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per service hour</td>
<td>$72.20</td>
<td>$65.13</td>
<td>$73.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per passenger trip</td>
<td>$5.32</td>
<td>$5.52</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips per service hour</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost recovery</td>
<td>37.77%</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
<td>36.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ridership
- Total ridership has increased as a result of the service change that went in last year; however, passenger trips per hour is slightly down compared to budget and 2016/17.

### Revenue
- Revenue is in line with expected revenue projections and higher than last year due to a 20% increase in tickets and passes.

### Total Cost
- Total cost is higher than 2016/17, but lower than budget due to service changes enacted last year. Savings came from ICBC insurance, Marketing, and Training and Education.
### Peer Comparison

#### Operating Cost Per Service Hour
- Salt Spring Island continues to perform better than its peers year over year in the area of operating cost per service hour.

#### Operating Cost Per Passenger Trip
- Higher than last year, but significantly lower than the peer average by about $14/passenger trip.

#### Operating Cost Recovery
- Continues to outperform it’s peers and is better than budget by about 1.3%.

#### Local Investment Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
<th>2017/18 Peer Average (Actuals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue service hours (000)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost ($000)</td>
<td>$668</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>$688</td>
<td>$464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Return on Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
<th>2017/18 Peer Average (Actuals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips (000)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue ($000)</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017/18 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Actual</th>
<th>2017/18 AOA Budget</th>
<th>2017/18 Peer Average (Actuals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per service hour</td>
<td>$72.20</td>
<td>$65.13</td>
<td>$73.68</td>
<td>$82.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per passenger trip</td>
<td>$5.32</td>
<td>$5.52</td>
<td>$5.17</td>
<td>$19.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger trips per service hour</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost recovery</td>
<td>37.77%</td>
<td>43.83%</td>
<td>36.40%</td>
<td>13.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3 year TIPs Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AOA Period</th>
<th>In Service Date</th>
<th>Annual Hours</th>
<th>Vehicle Requirements</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Total Costs</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Net Municipal Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19*</td>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,827</td>
<td>$34,351</td>
<td>$10,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Expand evening service on Monday to Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>Jun-19</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>$9,973</td>
<td>$2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Additional Earlier Saturday Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Implemented as of June 2018.
Thank you
SUBJECT  2019 OPERATING BUDGET AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PLAN

ISSUE

In accordance with Bylaw No 3850, “Salt Spring Island Community Transit and Transportation Commission Bylaw No.1, 2007”, the Commission’s approval of the annual budget is required.

BACKGROUND

The Capital Regional District (CRD) is required by legislation under the Local Government Act (LGA) to prepare a 5-year financial plan including Operating Budgets and Capital Expenditure Plans annually. CRD staff have therefore, prepared the financial plan shown in Appendix A to this report for the Salt Spring Community Transit and Transportation service.

The Operating Budget includes the regular annual costs to operate the service. The Capital Expenditure Plan shows the anticipated expenditures for capital additions. These may include purchases of new assets or infrastructure as well as upgrades or improvements to existing assets.

In preparing the Operating Budget, CRD staff took into account:

1. Actual expenditures incurred between 2016 and 2018
2. Anticipated changes in level of service (if any)
3. Maximum allowable tax requisition
4. Annual Cost per taxpayer and per SFE

Factors taken into consideration in the preparation of the Capital Expenditure Plan included:

1. Available funds on hand
2. Projects already in progress
3. Condition of existing assets and infrastructure
4. Future initiatives

Adjustments for surpluses or deficits from 2018 may be made in January 2019. The CRD Board will give final approval to the budget and plan in March 2019.

The Financial Plan for the years 2020 – 2023 may be changed in future years.

IMPLICATIONS

1. COMMUNITY TRANSIT

   (a) Operating Budget

   It is anticipated that operating expenses in 2018 will be approximately $1,790 under budget. The budget surplus will be transferred to capital reserve fund to balance the 2018 operating budget.
The 2019 operating budget has been increased by 5.7% to account for increased operating costs and the approved $2,360 service expansion noted on the budget summary sheet as an ongoing supplementary for the additional earlier Saturday service (recommended by the Commission on June 25, 2018). Transit revenue is anticipated to increase by 2.3% and to balance the operating costs a $37,290 transfer from operating reserve fund is required to keep the requisition increase to 5.7%.

The maximum requisition for 2018 is currently set at the greater of $245,000 or $288,666 ($0.076 per $1,000 of 2018 Actual Assessments). When the service was originally initiated monies were set aside in an internal operating reserve to deal with variable costs associated with fuel, repairs, and service. It is projected that in 2022 the service will utilize the maximum requisition and deplete the internal operating reserves to balance the 2022 operating budget. In order to sustain transit service operation the Commission will need to consider either increasing the maximum allowable requisition or reduce service. The last time the transit requisition was increased was in 2013. The Transportation Commission recommended an increase to the maximum allowable requisition from $71,750 to $245,000 by way of electoral assent through an alternative approval process.

(b) Transit Reserves:

The capital reserve fund is to be used to pay for capital expenditures that are not funded by other sources such as grants, operating budget or debt.

*Capital Reserve:* It is proposed, as a result of the projected 2018 operating budget surplus that the 2018 capital reserve transfer be increased to $10,620. The capital reserve has projected 2018 year-end balance of **$32,299**.

*Internal Reserve:* There are no planned transfers the internal reserve fund for 2019 – 2023. It is proposed that 2019 transfer to the operating budget be $37,290 to offset 2019 operating costs. This fund is projected to be depleted by the end of 2022 in order to offset continuing operating costs. The projected 2018 year-end balance is **$269,715**.

2. TRANSPORTATION

(a) Operating Budget

It is anticipated that operating expenses in 2018 will be approximately $10,070 over budget, due to unexpected pathway repairs at Long Harbour, Atkins, and Rainbow Road west of Atkins. CRD staff recommend that the planned 2018 budgeted transfers to the Capital and Operating Reserve Funds be reduced to balance the 2018 budget.

The 2019 operating budget has been decreased by 57.8% in accordance with Bylaw No. 3740, the maximum levy is the greater of $146,250 or $0.044/1000 ($167,122 based on 2018 Actual Assessments).

(b) Transportation Reserves

It is proposed that 2019 transfers to the capital reserve fund be $97,820 and $5,000 to the operating reserve fund for a total of $102,820. The projected 2018 year-end transportation reserve balance is estimated to be **$1,204,171.**
3. CAPITAL: TRANSIT AND TRANSPORTATION

(c) Capital Expenditure Plan

The 5-year plan includes $2,440,000 of expenditures to be funded by a combination of Community Works Funds grants and the service's capital reserve fund.

One new project was added in 2019. The Transportation Plan - Fulford Ganges Hill for $300,000 for the designs of pedestrian pathway and cycling lane. $20,000 has been included in the plan for a referendum to fund the construction. Pedestrian design improvements can be planned in 2020 and 2021 between Seaview Avenue and Hereford Avenue.

(d) Capital Funds On Hand

As specific capital projects are approved, the funding revenues for them are transferred into this Capital Project Fund. Whenever possible, any funds remaining upon completion of a project are transferred back to the Capital Reserve Fund for use on future capital projects.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Salt Spring Island Transportation Commission:

1. Recommend that the Electoral Area Services Committee approve the 2019 operating and capital budget as presented and recommend that the 2018 actual surplus or deficit be balanced on the 2018 transfers to the capital reserve funds; and

2. Recommend that the Electoral Area Services Committee recommend that the CRD Board approve the 2019 operating and capital budget and the five year financial plan for the Salt Spring Island Community Transit and Transportation Service as presented.

Submitted by: Karla Campbell, Senior Manager, Salt Spring Island Electoral Area

Attachments: Appendix A - 2019 Budget: SSI Community Transit and Transportation
CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT

2019 Budget

SSI Community Transit & Transportation

Commission Review

Compiled and Presented by CRD Finance

Oct-18
SERVICE DESCRIPTION:

Established by Bylaw #3438 the Salt Spring Island Transit and Transportation Service provides a public transportation system on Salt Spring Island, carries out transportation studies, provides for the construction, installation, maintenance and regulation of sidewalks and bicycle paths, parking facilities, pedestrian and safety and traffic calming facilities and implements transportation demand management programs.

PARTICIPATION:

The Electoral Area of Salt Spring Island

MAXIMUM LEVY:

Transit - $245,000 or $0.076 per $1,000 of actual assessments.

Transportation - $146,250 or $0.044 per $1,000 of actual assessments.

COMMISSION:

Salt Spring Island Community Transit and Transportation Commission.

FUNDING:

The transit service is funded by Transit Fare Revenue and requisition. The transportation service is funded by requisition.
### Budget Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018 BOARD BUDGET</th>
<th>ESTIMATED</th>
<th>2019 CORE BUDGET</th>
<th>ONGOING</th>
<th>ONE-TIME</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALT SPRING ISLAND COMMUNITY TRANSIT</strong></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>Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Municipal Obligation</td>
<td>402,080</td>
<td>400,200</td>
<td>436,160</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>438,520</td>
<td>488,650</td>
<td>675,180</td>
<td>587,700</td>
<td>598,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td>16,150</td>
<td>16,150</td>
<td>18,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,030</td>
<td>20,120</td>
<td>22,450</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>28,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING COSTS</strong></td>
<td>419,350</td>
<td>417,560</td>
<td>465,330</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>467,690</td>
<td>509,920</td>
<td>699,760</td>
<td>613,820</td>
<td>626,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentage increase over prior year</em></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>Capital / Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>8,830</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL / RESERVES</strong></td>
<td>8,830</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td>428,180</td>
<td>428,180</td>
<td>464,330</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>466,690</td>
<td>518,750</td>
<td>608,760</td>
<td>622,820</td>
<td>635,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Costs</strong></td>
<td>428,180</td>
<td>428,180</td>
<td>464,330</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>466,690</td>
<td>518,750</td>
<td>608,760</td>
<td>622,820</td>
<td>635,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Sources (Revenue)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Pass Revenue</td>
<td>(206,930)</td>
<td>(206,930)</td>
<td>(210,740)</td>
<td>(940)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(211,680)</td>
<td>(224,860)</td>
<td>(231,260)</td>
<td>(206,260)</td>
<td>(206,410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants in Lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>(320)</td>
<td>(320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Operating Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(15,220)</td>
<td>(15,220)</td>
<td>(37,200)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(37,200)</td>
<td>(63,770)</td>
<td>(113,700)</td>
<td>(49,370)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>(222,800)</td>
<td>(222,800)</td>
<td>(248,860)</td>
<td>(940)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(249,620)</td>
<td>(289,270)</td>
<td>(365,780)</td>
<td>(306,470)</td>
<td>(262,230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requisition</strong></td>
<td>(205,380)</td>
<td>(205,380)</td>
<td>(216,650)</td>
<td>(1,420)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(218,070)</td>
<td>(229,660)</td>
<td>(342,960)</td>
<td>(318,360)</td>
<td>(372,860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentage increase over prior year requisition</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Figures represent estimated budget amounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020.*
## Reserve/Fund Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Account</td>
<td>269,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>302,014</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reserve Schedule

**Reserve Fund:** 1.238 SSI Transit Internal Reserve FC 105409

### Reserve Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund: 1500</th>
<th>Fund Center: 105409</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>279,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure (to balance operating)</strong></td>
<td>(15,220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Income</strong></td>
<td>5,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance $</strong></td>
<td>269,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions/Background:**
To fund service expansions & bus leasing costs
## Reserve Schedule

**Reserve Fund:** SSI Transit Capital Reserve Fund - Bylaw 4214

### Reserve Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>21,251</td>
<td>32,299</td>
<td>29,299</td>
<td>26,299</td>
<td>35,299</td>
<td>44,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer from Ops budget</strong></td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Income</strong></td>
<td>428</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer to General Capital Fund</strong></td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions/Background:**
Capital Reserve Fund for future bus shelter replacements
### BUDGET REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Maintenance</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>6,360</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>6,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td>57,590</td>
<td>57,510</td>
<td>57,510</td>
<td>57,510</td>
<td>57,510</td>
<td>57,570</td>
<td>57,720</td>
<td>57,890</td>
<td>59,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,330</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>67,810</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Percentage Increase over prior year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL / RESERVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>326,400</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>97,820</td>
<td>97,920</td>
<td>97,330</td>
<td>95,950</td>
<td>95,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Operating Reserve Fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CAPITAL / RESERVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,330</strong></td>
<td><strong>101,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,640</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>396,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,450</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINDING SOURCES (REVENUE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Percentage Increase over prior year requisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-57.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve/Fund Summary</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Reserve Fund</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways CRF</td>
<td>25,443</td>
<td>60,443</td>
<td>95,443</td>
<td>130,443</td>
<td>165,443</td>
<td>200,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks CRF</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ganges Transportation Plan CRF</td>
<td>1,147,928</td>
<td>890,748</td>
<td>913,368</td>
<td>945,698</td>
<td>1,007,648</td>
<td>1,068,288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>986,991</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,049,611</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,121,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,223,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,324,531</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reserve Schedule

**Reserve Fund:** Maintenance Reserve Fund

For non-recurring repairs and maintenance on paths and trails

### Reserve Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer from Ops Budget</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance $</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reserve Schedule

**Reserve Fund: Capital Reserve Fund - Bylaw 3943**

For Pathway and Bike Lane infrastructure

### Reserve Cash Flow

**Fund: 1086 Fund Center: 102142**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>13,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Ops Budget</td>
<td>38,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from Island Pathways</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>25,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund balance should allow for CRD to participate in partnership with Island Pathways on planned projects

### Reserve Cash Flow

**Fund: 1086 Fund Center: 102147**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Ops Budget</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds received from property owners for sidewalks in front of their properties

### Reserve Cash Flow

**Fund: 1086 Fund Center: 102148**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Balance</strong></td>
<td>869,498</td>
<td>1,147,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Ops Budget</td>
<td>278,430</td>
<td>62,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to General Capital Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(320,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Balance</strong></td>
<td>1,147,928</td>
<td>890,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$250,000 per year transferred from requisition in accordance with Bylaw 3956 (four years 2013-2018)
# CAPITAL REGIONAL DISTRICT CAPITAL PLAN

## Prof. No.

The first two digits represent the year the project was in the capital plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Expenditure Type</th>
<th>Capital Project Title</th>
<th>Capital Project Description</th>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Asset Class</th>
<th>Funding Source Codes</th>
<th>Carry Forward From 2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>5-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-01 New</td>
<td>North Canyon Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Pedestrian pathways and cycling</td>
<td>$1,340,720</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ck</td>
<td>$1,100,720</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,100,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-02 New</td>
<td>North Canyon Transportation Plan (New)</td>
<td>Pedestrian pathways and cycling</td>
<td>$865,520</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$995,520</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$995,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-01 New</td>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>Bus shelters</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rfs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-02 New</td>
<td>Public Referendum</td>
<td>Public Referendum</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rfs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-01 New</td>
<td>Transportation Plan - Rattles Cayon Hill</td>
<td>Pedestrian pathways and cycling</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rfs</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

$2,440,000

*Total Project Budget*

This column represents the total project budget over the 5-year window.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service: 1.238B</th>
<th>Community Transportation (SSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj. No. 18-01</td>
<td>Capital Project Title North Ganges Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Class</td>
<td>Engineered Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Project Description Pedestrian pathways and cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priority Area Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Rationale Construct a multi-use pathway on north side of Rainbow Road from Lower Ganges Road to Rainbow Road recreation centre. Construct active transportation networks on Lower Ganges Road to Rainbow Road with intersection improvements for pedestrian safety at Upper and Lower Ganges Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. No. 18-01</td>
<td>Capital Project Title Bus Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Class</td>
<td>Engineered Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Project Description Bus shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priority Area Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Rationale Add bus shelter infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. No. 18-02 Public referendum</td>
<td>Capital Project Title Transportation Plan - Fulford Ganges Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Class</td>
<td>Engineering Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Project Description Pedestrian pathways and cycling design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priority Area Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Rationale Other pathway networks to be developed in collaboration with Island Pathways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. No. 19-01 Transportation Plan - Fulford Ganges Hill</td>
<td>Capital Project Title Pedestrian pathways and cycling designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Class</td>
<td>Engineering Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Project Description Pedestrian pathways and cycling designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Priority Area Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Rationale Active transportation improvements along Fulford-Ganges Hill into Ganges Village.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Projects Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year / Project#</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Capital Project Description</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure Actuals</th>
<th>Remaining Funds</th>
<th>Funding Source-CRF*</th>
<th>Funding Source-CWF**</th>
<th>Funding Source-Operating Funds</th>
<th>Return Surplus to CRF*</th>
<th>Return Surplus to CWF**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CX.066.2019</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>North Ganges Transportation Plan (Ph 2&amp;3)</td>
<td>935,280</td>
<td>168,748</td>
<td>766,532</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>685,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX.100.2006</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Atkins Road Pathway</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>40,649</td>
<td>54,351</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DX.101.2002</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Bus Shelter</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX.100.2007</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Booth Canal to Vesuvius Bay Rd</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BX.119.3500</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>SSI Traffic Study (non-capital)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>13,761</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,102,280</td>
<td>215,036</td>
<td>886,244</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>685,280</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CRF (Capital Reserve Fund)

** CWF (Community Works Fund)
## Islands Trust

### BYLAW REFERRAL FORM

**Island:** Salt Spring Island Trust Area  
**Bylaw No.:** 515  
**Date:** October 11, 2018

You are requested to comment on the attached Bylaw for potential effect on your agency's interests. We would appreciate your response within 30 days. If no response is received within that time, it will be assumed that your agency's interests are unaffected.

### APPLICANTS NAME / ADDRESS:

Gulf Islands Seniors Residence Association / 121 Atkins Road, Salt Spring Island, BC V8K 2X7

### PURPOSE OF BYLAW:

Bylaw No. 515 will rezone the subject property from Community Facility 1(d) to a Residential 12 (R12) zone variant that allows for the development of a 47 unit seniors' supportive housing complex with one guest unit and two staff units that includes medical offices and club meeting space.

### GENERAL LOCATION:

154 Kings Lane, Salt Spring Island

### LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

P1D: 003-106-758  
Lot 2, Section 4, Range 3 East, North Salt Spring Island, Cowichan District, Plan 23507

### SIZE OF PROPERTY AFFECTED:

1.44 ha  

### ALR STATUS:

N/A for the subject property, ALR adjacent, appropriate setbacks being met.

### OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN DESIGNATION:

n/a

### OTHER INFORMATION:

This project is often referred to as "Meadowlane". For the latest staff report and other information related to this application, please see our website: [http://www.islandtrust.bc.ca/islands/local-trust-areas/salt-spring/current-applications/current-application-documents/](http://www.islandtrust.bc.ca/islands/local-trust-areas/salt-spring/current-applications/current-application-documents/)

Please fill out the Response Summary on the back of this form. If your agency's interests are "Unaffected", no further information is necessary. In all other cases, we would appreciate receiving additional information to substantiate your position and, if necessary, outline any conditions related to your position. Please note any legislation or official government policy which would affect our consideration of this Bylaw.

**Signature:**  

**Name:** Patricia Maloney  
**Title:** Consultant Planner

This referral has been sent to the following agencies:

### First Nations

Cowichan Tribes  
Halalt First Nation  
Lake Cowichan First Nation  
Lyackson First Nation  
Penelakut Tribe  
Sgit'unus First Nation  
Malahat First Nation  
Pauquachin First Nation  
Tsaatlip First Nation  
Tsawout First Nation  
Tseycum First Nation  
Semiahmoo First Nation  
Tsawwassen First Nation

### Regional Agencies

CRD – All Referrals & K. Campbell (SSI Senior Manager)  
CRD – SSI Parks and Recreation  
CRD – SSI Building Inspection  
CRD – SSI Transportation Commission  
CRD – Ganges Water & Sewer Commission  
Vancouver Island Health Authority

### Non-Agency Referrals

BC Ambulance Service  
North Salt Spring Waterworks District  
School District No. 64  
SSI Fire-Rescue  
SSI Island Pathways

Hul'qu'uminu'um Treaty Group (for information only)  
Te'Mexw Treaty Association (for information only)
Adjacent Local Trust Committees and Municipalities
Galano Island Local Trust Committee
Mayne Island Local Trust Committee
North Pender Island Local Trust Committee
Thetis Island Local Trust Committee
Cowichan Valley Regional District

Provincial Agencies
Ministry of Environment
BC Assessment Authority
Ministry of Transportation & Infrastructure
Ministry of Natural Resource Operations – Archaeology Branch
Ministry of Forest Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development – Water Authorizations Section
Ministry of Forest Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development – Utility Regulation Section
Ministry of Forest Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development – Front Counter BC
Front Counter BC
BYLAW REFERRAL FORM
RESPONSE SUMMARY

☐ Approval Recommended for Reasons Outlined Below

☐ Approval Recommended Subject to Conditions Outlined Below

☐ Interests Unaffected by Bylaw

☐ Approval Not Recommended Due to Reason Outlined Below

Salt Spring Island Trust Area
(Island)

515
(Bylaw Number)

(Signature)

(Title)
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DATE OF MEETING: September 27, 2018
TO: Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee
FROM: Patricia Maloney, Dillon Consulting Planner
        Salt Spring Island Team
COPY: Stefan Cermak, Regional Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Amendment of Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw No. 515 (SS-BL-515) Zone R12(a)
        Applicant: Gulf Islands Seniors Residence Association
        Location: 154 Kings Lane

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee Bylaw No. 515, cited as “Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw, 1999, Amendment No. 3, 2018” be read a first time.

2. That Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee Bylaw No. 515, cited as “Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw, 1999, Amendment No. 3, 2018” be referred to the agencies, community groups, and First Nations shown in Attachment 11 of the staff report dated September 27, 2018, for review and comment.

REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this preliminary staff report is to introduce an application to rezone 154 Kings Lane from Community Facility 1(d) zoned land to a Residential 12 (R12) zone variant that allows for the development of a 47 unit seniors’ supportive housing complex with one guest unit and two staff units that includes medical offices and club meeting space (Attachment 1).

While generally supported by policies within the Salt Spring Island Official Community Plan, questions concerning potable water are outstanding. Upon First Reading, the Bylaw will be circulated to the referral agencies of jurisdiction at the present time, as their responses may inform further amendments to the proposed development plan.

BACKGROUND

The Gulf Islands Seniors Residence Association (GISRA) has applied to rezone 154 Kings Lane to allow for an affordable seniors’ supportive housing complex with associated medical office services and community uses, referred to as Meadowlane Affordable Seniors’ Residential facility, or “Meadowlane”. The current proposal includes 47 seniors units, 2 staff dwelling units, 1 guest suite, offices for medical staff, and private club space for the “Seniors for Seniors” Non-Profit Society. The rationale provided to date is centred on the applicant’s observed need for more affordable housing and community spaces aimed at seniors on Salt Spring Island and to further its mandate to improve housing affordability on Salt Spring Island for seniors.

The current Kings Lane Clinic (which is owned by the GISRA) will remain in place and be integrated into the operation of the seniors development to provide uninterrupted services to the community (Attachment 2).
The proposed development does not comply with current CF1 (d) zoning, which only permits one dwelling unit per lot accessory to, and located above, another permitted use. The R12 zone permits "seniors' supportive housing complex" as a principal use, defined as "a barrier-free housing development comprised of seniors' dwelling units and accessory dwelling units for resident staff, provided in combination with support services which are to include at least all of the following: monitoring response for medical emergencies, availability of one meal a day, housekeeping, laundry and recreational opportunities." The proposed development provides all of these services and amenities. The proposed building includes a 65m² leased club space for Salt Spring Seniors' Society. The proposed building also incorporates a 280m² clinic with doctors' offices. The R12 zone variation propose in Bylaw 515 would increase the maximum number of allowed medical practitioners from two (2) to twelve (12) to encompass both the doctors in the proposed building and the doctors that currently work out of the Kings Lane Clinic. Both "service club" and "dental and medical office services" would be included as permitted uses in the R12(a) zone.

At present, there are two buildings on the subject site. The Kings Lane Medical Clinic is a two-storey mixed use building with a medical clinic and two apartments (Attachment 3). The existing Kings Lane Medical clinic will remain on site. The proposal is to maintain the existing Kings Lane Clinic and build a seniors residence that will supplement the current clinic. This will ensure that the clinic remains open during construction and will continue to provide medical services to the community.

The other building is a single vehicle garage. This structure will be removed prior to any new construction starting on the site. The site context is provided in Attachment 4.

There are two parking lots on the property at present associated with the medical clinic, one for staff and one for public use. Parking will be expanded to allow for future parking. The calculated requirement is for 64 parking stalls required by the total development. However, to ensure that cross over of work shifts and provision of patient parking, the site plan provided by the applicant demonstrates a total of 99 parking stalls.

Relevant background materials attached to the staff report include the Water & Wastewater Report, Traffic Study, and Architectural Design Plans. These plans demonstrate that the current road system can manage the existing and the increase in traffic with no significant upgrades. The GISRA will upgrade Kings Lane in front of the proposed development, including constructing sidewalks in front of the development. Water is proposed via a combined system of rainwater harvest, treatment and storage supplemented by the current water line and source from the North Salt Spring Waterworks District.

Figure 1: Location Plan
Figure 2: Air Photo of Proposed Site
Policy/Regulatory

Islands Trust Policy Statement:

Staff have reviewed the Islands Trust Policy Statement and are satisfied that the land use policies have been sufficiently addressed and that it supports these bylaw amendments with the potential exception of potable water supply. There are still outstanding concerns regarding the provision of the required potable water sources for the development. This requires Vancouver Island Health Authority and Ministry of Environment confirmation as to the supply of potable water. Attachment 5 provides a summary of the applicable Islands Trust policies.

However, the bylaw amendments support policy directive 5.8.6 which states:

“Local trust committees and island municipalities shall, in their official community plans and regulatory bylaws, address their community’s current and projected housing requirements and the long-term needs for educational, institutional, community and health-related facilities and services, as well as the cultural and recreational facilities and services.”

Official Community Plan:

Pertaining to the Land Use Bylaw amendments, the Salt Spring Island Official Community Plan Bylaw No.355 provides several applicable statements. The complete list of applicable statements and an analysis on each is provided in Appendix 3.

The following Official Community Plan statements provide direction regarding multiple unit affordable housing projects which should be considered as part of both the rezoning and future development permit stage:

Part B- Residential Land Use Objectives and Policies

B.2.2.2.18 Preference should be given to rezoning applications for multiple-unit affordable housing projects that:

a. are based on the housing needs of existing residents and are not meant to be mainly marketed to off-island residents.

b. would provide owned or rental housing, possibly through non-traditional means such as cohousing, cooperative ownership, sweat equity projects or land trusts.

c. would create durable, and water and energy efficient housing.

d. provide walking, transit or cycling links to village services.

e. provide safe walking, transit, or cycling links to a school, if the project is designed for families.

f. include appropriate site and building designs, such as those outlined in Development Permit Area 1.

g. that are in or near island villages, except where the affordable housing would be linked to and support farming.

Comment: The proposal provides additional supportive seniors’ housing, addressing the needs of existing residents. It should be ensured that points c-f are properly addressed during the development permit stage.

B.2.2.2.22 The Local Trust Committee could consider other innovative strategies that would increase the community’s supply of affordable housing, including, but not limited to, consideration of rezoning applications that would permit additional dwellings where the floor area of the dwellings is
limited, energy and water efficient design is implemented, and sensitive ecosystems are protected.

Comment: GISRA is proposing to utilize rainwater harvest as one component of the water supply for this development. This will be addressed through the application of a covenant as part of the rezoning of this property, upon approval of VIHA.

B.5.1.2.2 ...where a multifamily development is comprised of special needs housing or affordable seniors’ supportive housing, the density of the development may exceed 37 units per ha, provided it does not exceed a floor space ratio of 0.6, a site coverage of 33 percent and a maximum of two storeys and a maximum of 50 units in any one development.

Comment: The proposed development, including the guest suite and the two staff housing units, does not exceed a floor space ratio of 0.6 or a site coverage of 33 percent, and is a total of 50 units. The proposed primary building is three storeys.

B.5.2.2.9 The Local Trust Committee may consider changing zoning to permit some 3-storey buildings in areas away from the shoreline, the Ganges Village Core and established view corridors.

Comment: The proposed development includes a 3-storey building away from the shoreline, the Ganges Village Core and established view corridor.

C.3.2.1.4 To encourage a variety of conservation methods in all community water systems.

Comment: LTC can require this at time of zoning with a covenant. It should be ensured that a variety of conservation methods are provided in the proposal during the development permit stage.

Application

The original application was submitted in May 2018 (Attachment 7). Since that time, GISRA Board members, consultants and architects have had multiple meetings and conversations with Islands Trust Staff and have made modifications to the application to respond to comments and concerns identified. The major changes that have occurred to the application include:

- Increasing the number of affordable seniors housing units from 36 to 47.
- Retaining the existing Kings Lane Medical Clinic and providing medical clinic facilities within the proposed Seniors complex
- Increasing the number of parking stalls to 99 to accommodate all residents, employees and patients.

Staff accept this as an amended application. To process this application, Islands Trust engaged Dillon Consulting Limited to specifically manage this application. The cost of the consultant is being paid for by GISRA.

Land Use Bylaw:

The site is currently zoned CF1(d). The proposed development does not comply with current CF1 (d) zoning, which is geared to community facilities and only permits the following uses:
Zone Variation – CF1(d)

(5) Despite all other regulations of this bylaw, the only principal uses permitted within lands zoned CF1(d) are:
(a) Public hospitals, clinics and health care facilities.
(b) Public schools, pre-schools and child care centres.
(c) Performing and visual art centres.
(d) Public service uses.

(6) Despite all other regulations of this bylaw, the only accessory uses permitted within lands zoned CF1(d) are:
(a) Incor retail sales accessory to another permitted use.
(b) Dwelling units accessory to, and located above, another permitted use.

The primary use of the proposed development is residential. For this reason, the CF1 zone is not suitable for this application and a rezoning is required. There is no residential district that specifically meets the proposed development and the uses. The closest zone in terms of intent is the existing R12 zoning, but this only permits “seniors’ supportive complex” and no other uses.

For this reason the proposed bylaw amendment is for R12 zone with an R12(a) zone variation. The variation is proposed to include both “medical clinic” and “service club” as permitted accessory uses and would allow two buildings on the property to reflect the retention of the existing clinic and the construction of the new building. It would also increase maximum height from 7.6 metres to 13 metres and density from 12 du/hectare to 41 du/hectare as shown in the Draft Bylaw (Attachment 1).

In addition to these regulations, the Land Use Bylaw Part 7 provides the calculations for parking. In addition, Section 9.9.5(3) contains additional parking requirements for parking and loading spaces as follows:

9.9.5 (3) (f) Despite the requirements for off street parking in Part 7, the following regulations apply within the Residential 12 zone: (i) One off-street parking space is to be provided for every three seniors’ dwelling units. (ii) One off-street parking space is to be provided for each employee and each visiting support worker expected to be working or resident on the site at one time.

Figure 4 provides the full calculation for the proposed development for both vehicles and bicycles. All parking will be surface parking. This considers the existing clinic and the proposed development and demonstrates that the project will require a total of 64 vehicle parking spaces and 23 bicycle parking spaces (as calculated as per Figure 4). This parking requirement is exceeded on site with the provision of 99 surface parking stalls as per the attached site plan (Figure 5).
Figure 4: Parking Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Area/ Units</th>
<th>Vehicle Parking Requirement</th>
<th>No. of Spaces</th>
<th>Bicycle Parking Requirement</th>
<th>No. of Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors unit</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 per 3 units (rounded up from 15.6)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 per 15 units without garages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff unit&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 per 1.25&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 + 1 per 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 per 1 unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors’ facility non-resident staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 per 1 unit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 per 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Clinics (2)&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>510 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 per 32.5 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 per 250 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Club</td>
<td>65 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 per 3.6 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 per 100 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total required parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues and Opportunities

The following are issues and opportunities that have been identified:

- **Housing Affordability** – The critical element of this development is that it provides affordable seniors’ supportive housing. To remain affordable, the development has to be economical to construct and cost effective to operate. GISRA has identified the need for affordable housing and has confirmed with BC Housing what will be considered affordable. The proposal for Meadowlane is to create a rent schedule similar to Meadowbrook. The rent is for the apartment only, but it includes water, sewer and power. The rent can be increased annually by the CPI, as per the Housing Agreement with the Islands Trust. It is assumed that the Meadowlane development will have the same type of affordable housing agreement. Adoption of an Affordable Housing Bylaw will be a condition of rezoning.

<sup>1</sup> Two staff units are located in the existing Kings Lane Clinic.
<sup>2</sup> Based on the parking requirement for multi family residential.
<sup>3</sup> Based on the 236 m<sup>2</sup> area of the existing King Lane Clinic plus 280 m<sup>2</sup> proposed area of the new medical facilities in the Seniors development, for a total of 516 m<sup>2</sup> of medical clinic facilities.
### Figure 6: Calculation of Meadowbrook Rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI *</th>
<th>1 Bdrm</th>
<th>2 Bdrm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$871</td>
<td>$1,101.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>$890</td>
<td>$1,126.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$915</td>
<td>$1,157.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>$932</td>
<td>$1,178.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>$1,204.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$971</td>
<td>$1,228.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>$993</td>
<td>$1,255.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,016</td>
<td>$1,284.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$1,046</td>
<td>$1,322.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
<td>$1,346.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>$1,096</td>
<td>$1,385.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$1,112</td>
<td>$1,406.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>$1,122</td>
<td>$1,419.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>$1,447.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>$1,157</td>
<td>$1,463.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$1,173</td>
<td>$1,484.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,518.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,228</td>
<td>$1,553.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,256</td>
<td>$1,588.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,285</td>
<td>$1,625.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$1,315</td>
<td>$1,662.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Potable water** – The property is within the North Salt Spring Waterworks District (NSSWW). The NSSWW announced a moratorium restricting properties currently on the Districts’ tax roll to a single 19 mm connection. This is insufficient to supply the proposed seniors residence. To resolve the water supply issue, GISRA is proposing a triple source strategy for potable water. To date, VIHA has not yet approved the approach. VIHA calculates potable water demand at 225 litres per day per person (based on Full Time Equivalent occupants). GISRA believes that this is excessive for the proposed development along with the water conservation measures being proposed for the seniors residence. A series of reservoirs for treated and raw potable water will be provided on site to ensure supply and back up.

GISRA has used the numbers from the Meadowbrook residence (based on 16 years of operation) to project the water demand for the Meadowlane development. Using the 45 resident units and an occupancy of 1.2 persons per unit (which has been the average occupancy for the Meadowbrook project for the past 10 years) and the ancillary uses, the Meadowlane development will enable Full Time Equivalent Occupancy of (rounded up) 86 people.
Figure 7: Projected Water Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER DEMAND</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Full Time Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>47 units</td>
<td>1.2 people per unit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Suite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Housing Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Full Time Equivalent People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While VIHA indicates that they want 225 litres of potable water per person per day, Meadowbrook has demonstrated year after year that their actual water use is just under 180 litres per person per day. In addition, newer water conservation measures, low flush toilets, and low flow showers should further reduce the total water consumption. Meadowlane is also considering the reuse of grey water for toilet flushing and on site irrigation. This analysis means that the Meadowland development will require between 18,984 and 15,120 litres of water per day. For a 365 day period, this then requires between 5.518 million litres per year and 6.929 million litres of potable water per year. The proposed sources of water are illustrated on Figure 8. The calculations show that if the development is mandated to use the 225 litre per day per person usage for water, if the well proves out, the combined water sources and water management will provide sufficient potable water for the period of the full year.

Figure 8: Potable Water Sources for Meadowlane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Salt Spring Waterworks District</td>
<td>25,000 imperial gallons per two months (94,635 litres)</td>
<td>681,915 litres per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Well&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8 litres per minute</td>
<td>4,977,685 litres per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater Harvest</td>
<td>24,000 catchment area</td>
<td>1,529,110 litres per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Water Supply</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7,188,710 litres per year</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant is currently conducting well testing. The well drilling reports and 24 hours testing of quantity, as well as quality, will be provided prior to the public hearing for the bylaw amendment. The engineering study completed for GISRA, by MSR Solutions Inc., May 1, 2018 (Attachment 9), concluded

<sup>4</sup> Well production to be confirmed by a well pump test and a hydrogeological assessment. In addition, quality of water will be provided to ensure potability.
that if the well produces 18 gal/minute, there is sufficient water to meet the water needs of the development based on water conservation devises as per the BC Building Code.

The application is in contravention of OCP policy B.5.1.2.2. Further evaluation of OCP policies related mostly to adequate water supply can only be evaluated with further information such as a hydrological test of the “proposed” well, confirmation from the NSSWW that 25,000 gallons/2 months is feasible, and VIHA etc. will approve the rainwater system.

- **Sewage disposal** - MSR Solutions Inc. have completed the water and waste water study for the proposed Seniors Residence. The estimated daily discharge requirements are anticipated to be 12m³/day, with a maximum discharge of 24m³/day. The proposed sanitary sewage treatment system is a communal septic field and tank system. Subsurface drip irrigation (SDDI) is proposed as the primary method for effluent disposal. This system involves buried plastic (PVC) tubes containing embedded emitters located at regular spacing. This is a traditional sanitary sewer system. There are a wide variety of configurations and equipment used. The system will be designed and approved by VIHA. The system will be supplemented by rapid infiltration basins for the effluent disposal. The MSR report indicates that the proposed treatment system will be reliable and robust to meet the requirements of the peak hourly demand (Attachment 9).

- **Traffic** - the Transportation Impact Study was prepared by Bunt & Associates early in the process (Attachment 10). The number of units and the inclusion of the existing Kings Lane Medical Clinic will generate additional traffic that was not originally included in the TIA. It is anticipated that this will increase the peak vehicle trips by less than 3 vehicles. GISRA will be required to update the TIA prior to the community information meeting and the Public Hearing.

- **Views and Impact of the Height of the Proposed Structure** – Meadowlane is a three storey building. This is a typical height for seniors residences and is similar to a few other developments on Salt Spring Island. The site is located next to a significant power line which has setbacks that restricts the proposed development. The ALR woods at the rear of the site exceed the height of the proposed building. The proposed setback for the side yard on the south side of the proposed development is a minimum of 20.61 metres. The proposed height of the structure will not exceed 13 meters. Any shadows cast on the property to the south will be minimal given the fact that the sun direction will be primarily from the south and the west, creating the majority of the shadowing on the north side of the building, which will fall on the parking and hydro right of way. In addition, mature vegetation will be maintained on the south property line to create a visual screen for the residential development to the south. The front setback for the development is 27 metres to the existing Kings Lane Clinic with the proposed structure being located behind the Kings Lane Clinic. Therefore, the visual on the street will be the existing clinic. The road right of way is 20 metres. The residential development to the east will not be impacted by over shadowing.

- **Adjacency to ALR lands** - The rear property line abuts the Royal Canadian Legion and a strip of Agricultural Land Reserve. The ALR land is heavily treed and has been developed with paths and picnic tables. GISRA is proposing that the pathway system connect to the Legion’s Living Forest and create an amenity for the area. The development of the GISRA development will not impact the continued operation of the forest. Pedestrian pathways will connect the GISRA development to the Living Forest and Kings Lane which may ultimately lead to Lower Ganges Road.

- **Pedestrian Connectivity** – The proponents have had discussions with Islands Trust staff in regards to the inclusion of sidewalks/pathways along Kings Lane. Other pedestrian connectivity will be provided to the open space on the ALR land to the rear of the development.
The application is not identified to be in contravention with any of the Official Community Plan, however certain OCP statements related to the provision of adequate water supply require referral to the approving water authority, Vancouver Island Health Authority, and formal approval as a condition of rezoning.

As per C.3.2.2.1 of the Official Community Plan:

"when the Local Trust Committee receives rezoning applications for land inside the boundaries of a community water system, it will refer the application to the operators of the affected system. Should such zoning changes be proposed, the applicant could be encouraged to suggest other water supplies so that the application could be considered. Examples are rainwater catchment, groundwater use or a water conservation program".

Consultation

The Gulf Island Seniors Resident Association (GISRA) will conduct a community Open Space after first reading of the Bylaw. The date and location will be selected in conversation with the GISRA and Islands Trust staff. At the Open House, all of the relevant information, including site plans, building elevations and any operational information available at the time will be provided. At the Open House, attendees will be asked to provide comments, concerns and ideas and all of these will be recorded and provided to Islands Trust as part of the record of community engagement.

It is recommended that the formal circulation of the bylaw to the agencies and referral bodies will occur after First Reading of the Bylaw. The application will be public and anyone can provide their comments. All comments will be recorded and Dillon Consulting Limited, along with Islands Trust staff, will review the comments and determine how to address the comments. This may require modifications to the application, which would then be discussed and reviewed with GISRA. Any changes that are proposed to the original application will be presented at a regular business meeting of the LTC.

The Local Trust Committee may hold a Community Information Meeting prior to advancing to Public Hearing. For the Community Information Meeting, GISRA will have to address any concerns raised in the circulation process, will require a complete a full hydrogeological assessment and provide well reports demonstrating evidence of supply of potable water.

Statutory Requirements

In accordance with requirements of the Local Government Act and Salt Spring Island Development Procedures Bylaw No. 304, notification of the amendment must be mailed out to all tenants and owners of parcels within 100 metres of the subject parcel.

Agencies

This application will be circulated to a variety of agencies and authorities but one of the most critical agencies is the Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA), as the potable water approving authority. The proposed source of water is rainwater harvest, supplemented by the existing connection to the Salt Spring Water Co-op. VIHA has indicated the volume of water required but refuses to make any comment on the source and treatment of potable water proposed by the GISRA until they get a formal circulation of the application.

Other agencies that will be circulated will include the Ministry of Transportation, Environment, School Districts and adjacent neighbours. See Attachment 11 for a list of recommended agencies and First Nations for bylaw referral.
Rationale for Recommendation

The recommendations of the amendments to Land Use Bylaw No. 355 to create an R12(a) zone variation and rezone the subject property at 154 Kings Lane are generally found to be supported by the Island Trust Policy Statement and Official Community Plan, assuming the volume and availability of potable water is proven and accepted by the approving agencies. The parking provided in the proposed development is in accordance with Parts 7 and 9 of the Land Use Bylaw. The medical clinic, although not an approved use under existing R12 zoning, is already an existing use on the subject property and therefore provision for it under the new zoning variation is considered appropriate and compatible. The service club component of the proposed development is, in the opinion of staff, complementary to the seniors’ supportive housing complex and provision under an R12(a) zoning variation would be seen as in accordance with the Island Trust Policy Statement and Official Community Plan.

Staff are recommending first reading of the rezoning bylaw to allow the application to proceed to formal circulation and to begin the community engagement.

ALTERNATIVES

The LTC may consider the following alternatives to the staff recommendation:

1. **Request further information**

   The LTC may request further information prior to making a decision. Staff advise that the implications of this alternative are additional time and resources allocated to the proposal. If selecting this alternative,
the LTC should describe the specific information needed and the rationale for this request. For example, more clarification on the sources and volume of potable water. Recommended wording for the resolution is as follows:

That the Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee request that the applicant for SS-RZ-2018.4 provide more information regarding the volume and quality of potable water.

2. **Deny the application**

   The LTC may deny the application. Staff advise that the implications of this alternative are file closure and application refund. If this alternative is selected, the LTC should state the reasons for denial. Recommended wording for the resolution is as follows:

   *That the Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee deny application SS-RZ-2018.4 for the following reasons: [insert reasons]*.

3. **Hold the application in abeyance**

   The LTC may choose to hold the application in abeyance pending completion of the completion of any additional background work. No resolution for this decision is required.

### NEXT STEPS

The next steps in the process include:

- **Formal circulation to the agencies and departments** — Islands Trust staff will circulate the application to the key agencies including Vancouver Island Health Authority. It is recommended that the agencies are asked to respond within 3 weeks. GISRA and Dillon will meet with agencies and Islands Trust Staff to capture the comments and determine if modifications to the application are required.

- **Notification to Adjacent landowners and tenants** — Islands Trust staff will circulate the notification of the bylaw amendment application to the adjacent landowners and tenants.

- **Developer sponsored Open House** — GISRA will schedule an open house to present the proposed bylaw amendment to the greater community. The Open House will be advertised in the local paper, posted on the Islands Trust web site and notices posted in the Kings Lane Clinic.

- **Staff will present referral responses and open house results to the LTC at a regular business meeting.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By:</th>
<th>Patricia Maloney, Dillon Consulting Planner</th>
<th>September 12, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concurrence:</td>
<td>Stefan Cermak, Regional Planning Manager</td>
<td>September 20, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Bylaw No. 515
2. Site Plan
3. Site Inspection Memo and Photographs
4. Site Context
5. ITPS/OCP Policies
6. Rationale for An Affordable Seniors Project
7. Application and Supporting Materials
8. Architectural Design Plans
9. Water & Wastewater Report
10. Traffic Study
11. Agency and First Nations Referrals
A BYLAW TO AMEND SALT SPRING ISLAND LAND USE BYLAW, 1999

The Salt Spring Island Local Trust Committee, being the Trust Committee having jurisdiction in respect of the Salt Spring Island Local Trust Area under the Islands Trust Act, enacts as follows:

1. Citation

This bylaw may be cited for all purposes as “Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw 1999, Amendment No.3, 2018”.

2. Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw No. 355, cited as “Salt Spring Island Land Use Bylaw 1999” is amended as follows:

2.1 By inserting in Subsection 9.2.4 – Exceptions in Particular Locations – the following new Residential 12 Zone Variation (a):

“Zone Variation – R12(a)

(27) The following additional use is permitted:

(a) Dental and Medical office services for a maximum of 12 medical practitioners

(b) Service club

(28) All seniors’ dwelling units within a seniors’ supportive housing complex must be affordable housing dwelling units

(29) Despite Subsection 9.9.2, the maximum density for the site shall be 50 dwelling units. Of those dwelling units:

(a) Two dwelling units may be exclusively for residential use or temporary occupancy by persons employed at the seniors’ supportive housing complex for wages or salary and their families.
(b) One **dwelling unit** may be exclusively for **temporary occupancy** by guests of **seniors’ supportive housing complex** residents.

(30) Despite Subsection 9.9.2, a single three storey building is permitted with a maximum height of 13 metres.

And by making consequential numbering alterations to effect this change.

2.2 By changing the zoning classification of Lot 2, Section 4, Range 3 East, North Salt Spring Island, Cowichan District, Plan 23507, municipal address 154 Kings Lane Salt Spring Island, encompassing 13,888.1 square metres from CF1(d) to R12(a), as shown on Plan No. 1 attached to and forming part of this bylaw, and by making such alterations to Schedule “A” of Bylaw No. 355 as are required to effect this change.

---

**READ A FIRST TIME THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

**READ A SECOND TIME THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

**PUBLIC HEARING HELD THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

**READ A THIRD TIME THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

**APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ISLANDS TRUST THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

**ADOPTED THIS**  
DAY OF  
20__

________________________  
Chair  
________________________  
Secretary
MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Walker

CC: Chantelle Charron, Callum Crawford, Stefan Cermak, Shad Mayne

FROM: Patricia Maloney

DATE: August 15, 2018

OUR FILE NO.: 18-8231

SUBJECT: Salt Spring Seniors Housing Rezoning Project – Site Inspection

Further to our meeting regarding the Meadowlane Affordable Senior’s Residence on Salt Spring Island on Monday August 13th, Richard and I completed a site inspection of the property.

The following photos illustrate the current site and adjacent properties. The site is already developed with two temporary uses (roofing company and a security company) and the current medical clinic. Most of the site is cleared. There is a major power line adjacent to the property that requires a significant building setback. However, within that setback parking, septic field and water reservoir can be installed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The well on the site is located at the rear of the property. This well can provide support water supply for the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rear Property Adjacent Uses
The Salt Spring Legion is located at the rear of the property. Along with the Legion parking lot is the “legion forest”. This area of heavily vegetated buffer, with a paved walking path is designated as Agricultural Reserve and dedicated as a park. This will provide visual screening from the proposed residence to the Legion parking lot and provide an amenity to the future residents of Meadowlane. Trees existing on the subject property adjacent to the Legion are currently required to remain standing and in good health as per existing zoning and good edge planning practices.

Kings Lane Medical Clinic
This is a photo of the front elevation of the current Kings Lane Medical Clinic. This clinic currently provides medical services to the community. Located a few blocks from the hospital and with extensive parking, it is understood that the clinic will be replaced. The current thinking is to sell and move the structure rather than demolishing the building. Timing for this removal will be determined at time of rezoning.

Kings Lane Medical Clinic
This is a photo of the rear elevation of the Medical Clinic. There is parking in the rear, the front and the north side of the building near the power line.

Power Line
The power line runs along the north property line and has a significant setback (the height of the towers) for any structures. Parking and septic field currently are located within the setback. It is proposed that parking, septic and water reservoir be located within this setback and no structures in future encroach on this setback.
Parking Area
The Kings Lane Medical Clinic has extensive parking to the north of the building, in the rear of the building, to the south of the building and to the west of the building. Current parking far exceeds the bylaw requirements for the existing uses. Given the set back from the power line, the new facility will also have extensive areas for parking.

Kings Lane
Kings Lane is a paved road with no shoulder or sidewalks. The new development will be required to construct pathways along the frontage of the property. They will end in grass and ditch. The street is low volume due to the fact that there is little development on the street and it dead ends further up the road past the power line.

View from Kings Medical Clinic property to the south.

Kings Lane
Road standards are very rural.

View from Kings Medical Clinic property to the north

The current site is viewed below showing the existing clinic, the parking, Kings Lane and the green area behind the clinic.
The following image illustrates the current road network. Kings Lane is accessed via Blain Road off Lower Ganges Road. Kings Lane terminates at Scarf Lane which connects to Norton Road which exits onto Lower Ganges Road. King's Lane also connects to Howell Lane which connects to Upper Ganges Road and provides an alternate route out of Ganges towards Long Harbour Road and ferries.
The site is well suited for a senior's residence. The site is 425 metres from the mall on Lower Ganges Road which includes the Country Grocer, Liquor Store, and Pizza restaurant. Also in very close proximity are:

- Lady Minto/Gulf Islands Hospital
- Additional restaurants
- RCMP
- Government services building
- Legion
- Churches
- Seniors Drop in Centre

The site inspection confirms that this is an excellent site for a senior’s residence. The added benefit of it being proposed as an affordable development and is within walking distance from several important community amenities will create an excellent opportunity for the future residents.
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Dear Richard:

Re: Meadowlane Mixed Use Development, 154 Kings Lane, Salt Spring Island Transportation Impact Study – Draft Report

Bunt & Associates Engineering Ltd. (Bunt) has completed our Transportation Impact Assessment for the proposed mixed land use development at 154 Kings Lane, Salt Spring Island. Our Draft Report provided herewith addresses the potential transportation impacts of the proposed senior’s residence, commercial and medical office development.

We look forward to our continued work on this exciting project.

Best regards,
Bunt & Associates

Jason Potter, M.Sc. PTP
Senior Transportation Planner
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This document was prepared by Bunt & Associates for the benefit of the Client to whom it is addressed. The copyright and ownership of the report rests with Bunt & Associates. The information and data in the report reflects Bunt & Associates’ best professional judgment in light of the knowledge and information available to Bunt & Associates at the time of preparation. Except as required by law, this report and the information and data contained are to be treated as confidential and may be used and relied upon only by the client, its officers and employees. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions made based on it, are the responsibilities of such third parties. Bunt & Associates accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed Meadowlane development is located at 154 Kings Lane on Salt Spring Island, BC. The development site is currently occupied with a 236 m² medical clinic and a 16 space surface parking lot.

The proposed development includes one building with 43 residential units, of these, 36 are Senior Independent Living residential units, five are transitional housing units, and two are staff residence units. There is also an attached 47 m² pharmacy, a 47 m² hair salon and a 65 m² community group room. Other common areas in the building are considered ancillary to the resident units including a 459 m² medical clinic.

To be conservative this study calculates the impacts of the new 464 m² medical clinic, the hair salon, the pharmacy and the community group room as separate development entities rather than being ancillary to the residential land use.

The proposed development is anticipated to generate approximately 40 to 50 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour period. The applied assumption that the existing medical clinic will be retained, results in a total site trip generation of approximately 60 two-way vehicle trips per peak hour, or one vehicle entering or leaving the site per minute.

The redeveloped site will have three vehicle access points from King Lane and a pick-up/drop-off area in front of the building’s main entrance.

Traffic operations at the intersection of Lower Ganges Road & Blain Road Intersection were analyzed using summer adjusted vehicle volumes. The intersection was found to operate within capacity thresholds during the existing PM peak hour, as well as during future 2030 background and total (with development) scenarios.

The current bylaw requires a minimum of 78 vehicle parking spaces. The proposed parking supply of 91 parking spaces exceeds Bylaw requirements.

The development is providing a 22 m² bicycle / scooter storage room within the parkade structure. This room is anticipated to accommodate approximately 20 scooters and/or bicycles which exceed Bylaw minimum requirements.

The site’s ability to accommodate garbage and loading vehicles on-site was confirmed using AutoTURN vehicle turn path software.

A Special Crosswalk (signed and marked with pedestrian push-button activation) is recommended at the east leg of the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection due to an observed existing pedestrian crossing desire line at this location which is anticipated to increase with the introduction of the proposed
development. The recommended pedestrian crossing treatment matches the crossing at Crofton Road, which is 200 m to the east of Blain Road.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Study Purpose, Scope & Objectives
Gulf Island Seniors Residence Association (GISRA) is proposing to develop a new seniors housing and commercial mixed use development located at 154 Kings Lane on Salt Spring Island, BC. The study area is shown in Exhibit 1.1.

Bunt has been retained by Global Philanthropic to complete a Transportation Impact Study to determine what transportation impacts the proposed development will have on the nearby transportation network.

1.2 Organization of Report
This report is organized as follows:

- Section 1.3 discusses the proposed development;
- Section 2 discusses the existing transportation conditions surrounding the site;
- Section 3 estimates the future traffic conditions in the study area;
- Section 4 reviews the site's parking provisions;
- Section 5 examines the site's access and circulation; and,
- Section 6 summarizes the report's conclusions and recommendations.

1.3 Proposed Development
At this time the development includes 43 total residential units (36 Senior Independent Living units and seven other units).

The existing 236 m² clinic may remain; this is yet to be determined. For the purposes of this study it is assumed that the existing clinic is retained.

A new medical clinic is also included in the development plan, it is meant to operate as an ancillary service to the units; however, again in an effort to be conservative, we have added the impact of the new 464 m² clinic as a separate development entity.

The 47 m² pharmacy and 47 m² hair salon are anticipated to draw visitors from outside the development and hence are calculated as separate traffic generators.

The current site plan is shown in Exhibit 1.2. The proposed land uses examined by Bunt are summarized in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1: Proposed Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Independent Living</td>
<td>36 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff residence</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td>47 m² or 500 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>47 m² or 500 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>65 m² or 704 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office (new)</td>
<td>464 m² or 5,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office</td>
<td>236 m² or 2,540 ft²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five transitional housing apartments are intended for adults that are transitioning from their own homes to Senior Independent Living apartments.

The development proposes 91 parking spaces, 67 of these spaces are surface spaces and 24 are within an underground parkade structure.

A pick-up/drop-off passenger zone will be provided in front of the residential access.
Exhibit 1.1
Study Area
2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

2.1 Context
The study area was shown on Exhibit 1.1. The development site is located approximately 1.5 km northwest of Ganges in North Ganges.

The Lady Minto / Gulf Island Hospital is just 200 m southeast of the development site. Between the site and the hospital is Greenwoods, which is comprised of a 30 unit Assisted Living residence building and a Complex Care facility.

The site is a short walk (360 m) from various commercial amenities such as Country Grocer, a liquor store, a coffee shop and a pharmacy.

The land parcels immediately adjacent to the site and towards the north along Kings Lane and Howell Lane are single family residential lots.

2.2 Existing Transportation Network

2.2.1 Road Network
Kings Lane is approximately 6.5 m wide with one travel lane in each direction. It has no sidewalks, curbs or gutters.

Lower Ganges Road is an arterial route connecting Ganges and eastern parts of the Island to the Island’s northwest areas including the Vesuvius Ferry Terminal. It has no curbs or gutters. Lower Ganges Road has an approximate 10.5 m cross section that includes one travel lane in each direction and bike lanes on both sides. There is a separated pedestrian path along Lower Ganges Road’s north edge.

Blain Road has an approximate 8 m cross section, with one travel lane in each direction and a pedestrian path along its east edge. It has no curbs or gutters.

The existing study area laning and traffic control is shown in Exhibit 2.1.

2.2.2 Existing Traffic
Bunt collected vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist traffic data at the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection on April 3, 2018 from 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM.

This time period were selected in consultation with available datasets including Capital Regional District daily volume datasets obtained from the nearby Lower Ganges Road and Upper Ganges Road intersection.

The peak hour of traffic occurred from 3:15 to 4:15 PM.
The obtained volumes align well with CRD Automated Vehicle Count Reports from the nearby Lower Ganges Road and Upper Ganges Road intersection (September 2014 and 2016 volumes).

During Bunt's count program, four pedestrians were observed to cross Lower Ganges Road at the east leg of the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection. There is no marked pedestrian crossing at this point. Approximately eight pedestrians were observed crossing the Blain Road and Lower Ganges Road's north leg.

2.2.3 Seasonal Summer Factor

CRD’s available traffic datasets do not include a summer dataset, therefore in order to apply a seasonal factor to obtain peak summer conditions the CRD's 2014 Report and 2015 Action Plan SSI Community Economic Development Commission was consulted where the Island is estimated to have a 15% increase in population during summer months.

The observed April 2018 vehicle volumes factored up by 15% to represent summer period volumes are presented in Exhibit 2.2.

2.2.4 Cycling & Pedestrian Networks

The site is approximately 1.5 km from Ganges’s commercial centre, or an approximate 20 minute walk. The desire to develop the walkability of this area has been a planning priority for the Island. Recommendations from reports such as The Island Trust’s 2007 North Ganges Village Transportation Management Plan and CRD’s Gulf Islands Regional Trails Plan have led to the development of the separated walkway along Lower Ganges Road’s north edge. The pathway is still under development with a goal of completing the pathway from Ganges to Portlock Park by 2020.

There is a Special Crosswalk with pedestrian push-button activation at the Crofton Road and Lower Ganges Road intersection's west leg which is approximately 200 m east of Blain Road. This pedestrian crossing is shown in Figure 2.1, and its location is illustrated on Exhibit 2.1.

There is also a pedestrian walkway that runs along Blain Road’s east edge (shown in Figure 2.2). It has an inconsistent width but is generally 1.0 to 1.5 m in width. It extends from Lower Ganges Road to the south edge of the Greenwoods Assisted Living Residential building.

There are currently no sidewalks along Kings Road.
Figure 2.1: Nearby Pedestrian Crossing Treatment

Figure 2.2: Blain Road Pedestrian Path – Two Photos
Exhibit 2.2
Existing Weekday PM Summer Adjusted Vehicle Volumes
2.2.5 Transit Network

The development site is served by BC Transit. Routes 1, 3, 5, and 6 all travel along Lower Ganges Road. The bus stops on Lower Ganges Road are approximately 400 m from the development site. These transit routes provide connections to Ganges and all three island ferry terminals.

2.2.6 Rideshare

Salt Spring Island Exchange on-line community forum has a rideshare category. It is typically used for Salt Spring Island residents who are looking to share a ride to an off-island location.

2.3 Existing traffic Operations

2.3.1 Performance Thresholds

The existing operations of Blain Road and Lower Ganges Road intersection were assessed using the methods outlined in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), using the Synchro 9 analysis software. The traffic operations were assessed using the performance measures of Level of Service (LOS) and volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio.

The LOS rating is based on average vehicle delay and ranges from "A" to "F" based on the quality of operation at the intersection. LOS "A" represents minimal delay conditions while a LOS "F" represents an over-capacity condition with considerable congestion and/or delay. Delay is calculated in seconds and is based on the average intersection delay per vehicle.

Table 2.1 below summarizes the LOS thresholds for the six Levels of Service, for both signalized and unsignalized intersections.

**Table 2.1: Intersection Level of Service Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>AVERAGE CONTROL DELAY PER VEHICLE (SECONDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNALIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;10 and ≤20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;20 and ≤35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;35 and ≤55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;55 and ≤80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Capacity Manual

The volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of an intersection represents the ratio between the demand volume and the available capacity. A V/C ratio less than 0.85 indicates that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate demands and generally represents reasonable traffic conditions in suburban settings. A V/C value between 0.85 and 0.95 indicates an intersection is approaching practical capacity; a V/C ratio over 0.95 indicates that traffic demands are close to exceeding the available capacity, resulting in saturated conditions. A V/C ratio over 1.0 indicates a very congested intersection where drivers may have
to wait through several signal cycles. In downtown and Town Centre contexts, during peak demand periods, V/C ratios over 0.90 and even 1.0 are common.

The performance thresholds that were used to trigger consideration of roadway or traffic control improvements to support roadway or traffic control improvements employed in this study is an individual movement Level of Service = LOS E or better, unless the volume is very low in which case LOS F is acceptable. Detailed Synchro reports are provided in Appendix A for each analysis scenario.

2.3.2 Existing Traffic Operations Analysis Results

The existing (2018) summer adjusted vehicle volume traffic operations analysis results are shown in Exhibit 2.3. As shown in Exhibit 2.3 all approaches at the Blain Road and Lower Ganges Road intersection currently operate within threshold criteria.
3. FUTURE CONDITIONS

3.1 Future Site Traffic

3.1.1 Trip Generation

Bunt used a combination of trip generation rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) to estimate the number of gross vehicle trips generated by the proposed development during the weekday PM peak hour. In order to be conservative, the traffic forecast assumed that the seven residential units available to staff and transitional residents would be occupied by the general population (not Seniors Independent Living). The number of gross vehicle trips is summarized in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>TRIP RATE</th>
<th>VEHICLE TRIPS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>TOTAL TWO-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Independent Living:</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0.31/ unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing:</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.62/ unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office:</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.18/ 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new 5,000 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon 500 ft²</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1.45/ 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy 500 ft²</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8.40/ 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2.74/ 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3.1 indicates, the gross number of vehicle trips anticipated to be generated by the development is approximately 48 two-way vehicle trips in the PM peak hour (26 inbound, 22 outbound). This equates to approximately 1 vehicle entering and 1 vehicle exiting the site every two to three minutes. This 48 trip estimate is considered conservative as it calculates the impact of the medical clinic, hair salon and pharmacy separately rather than accounting for internal trip deductions (residents using the commercial land uses).

Using the same medical clinic trip rates for the existing site results in an existing weekday PM trip generation of approximately 14 two-way trips. Adding the proposed development generated trips to the existing trips results in a total of approximately 62 total two-way vehicle trips per weekday PM peak hour.

Bunt used a trip generation rate of 60 vehicles per peak hour which conservatively applies a slight discount to the total calculated 62 trips in acknowledgement of internal trips inherent to mixed use developments. In this present context all commercial uses are anticipated to be used by site residents.
3.1.2 Trip Distribution & Assignment

The vehicle trips generated by the proposed development were assigned to the road network based on the existing traffic patterns. The estimated trip distributions are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Estimated Site Trip Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN/DESTINATION</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lane – Howell Lane – Leisure Lane - North East</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blain Road – South to Lower Ganges Road – West</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blain Road – South to Lower Ganges Road – South East</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site generated weekday PM peak hour vehicle volumes are presented in Exhibit 3.1. Seasonal factors are not applied to site trips as the analysis assumes full occupancy.
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3.2 **Background Traffic**

Background traffic represents future traffic scenarios without the proposed development. They are generated by applying a growth factor to existing 2018 summer adjusted volumes.

### 3.2.1 Growth Rate

Island Trust suggested a 2.5% per year growth rate. Other sources such as CRD population data suggest nearly a 1% yearly growth rate. The most recent 2016 Canada census found a 3.2% growth between 2011 and 2016 again suggesting an approximate 1% (or less) yearly growth rate. To be conservative Bunt applied a 2.5% yearly growth rate to the summer adjusted 2018 traffic volumes to calculate the background 2030 vehicle volumes.

### 3.2.2 Background 2030

The Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection's anticipated 2030 background vehicle volumes and traffic operations (without the proposed development) are illustrated in Exhibits 3.2 and Exhibit 3.3 respectively.

As shown the intersection is anticipated to operate within the threshold criteria during the future 2030 weekday PM peak hour period. The minor street (Blain Road) delays result in LOS D, which indicates average delays of 25 to 35 seconds. These delays are considered acceptable and therefore no mitigation is required from a vehicle capacity perspective.

3.3 **Total Traffic**

Total traffic is the amount of traffic that will exist following the proposed development's construction. The total traffic for this project was estimated by summing the background traffic (Exhibit 3.2) and the net new site traffic (Exhibit 3.1). The total traffic volume forecast is shown in Exhibit 3.4.

### 3.3.1 Total Traffic Operations

The results from the total 2030 traffic operations analysis is shown in Exhibit 3.5. Traffic operations results of the total traffic scenario are similar to those of the background traffic scenario.

As shown in Exhibit 3.5 the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection is anticipated to remain within threshold criteria during the future 2030 weekday PM peak hour period with the proposed development. The minor street (Blain Road) delays remain at a LOS D, which indicates average delays of 25 to 35 seconds. These delays are again considered acceptable and therefore no mitigation is required from a vehicle capacity perspective.
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3.4 Pedestrian Network

The development includes a sidewalk along the development fronting southwest edge of Kings Lane. There is a pedestrian route along Blain Road’s east edge, which extends from Kings Lane to Lower Ganges Road with the exception of the area fronting Greenwoods Eldercare Society.

There is the separated walkway along Lower Ganges Road’s north edge which extends both east and west from Blain Road. There is also a sporadic sidewalk along Lower Ganges Road’s south edge including a segment that approaches the Blain Road intersection.

3.4.1 Pedestrian Volumes

During Bunt’s count program four pedestrian were observed to cross Lower Ganges Road at the east leg of the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection. Approximately eight pedestrians were observed crossing the Blain Road and Lower Ganges Road intersection’s north leg.

In light of the observed pedestrian desire lines for crossing Lower Ganges Road at the Blain Road intersection Bunt conducted a Pedestrian Crossing Warrant at this intersection. The Pedestrian Crossing Warrant is presented in the following section.

3.4.2 Pedestrian Crossing Warrant

The Pedestrian Crossing Control Manual for British Columbia (Ministry of Transportation, 1994) was used to examine the viability and need for a pedestrian crossing of Lower Ganges Road at its intersection with Blain Road. The warrant takes into account crossing time measured by crossing distance, crossing opportunities, which is a product of conflicting vehicle volumes, and forecasted pedestrian crossing demands. They also take into account stopping sight distances for approaching vehicles, proximity of adjacent traffic or pedestrian signals or crosswalks, and road geometry.

During Bunt’s traffic count program four people were observed crossing Lower Ganges Road at the east leg of the Blain Road intersection. In the future this is anticipated to increase to 10 desired crossings per peak hour. The number of crossing demand is calculated using Equivalent Adult Units (EAU) where seniors and children are given factors of 2.0 and 1.5 respectively. As the area is near a hospital and many senior residences a factor of 1.5 was applied to the 10 forecasted pedestrians for an estimated EAU pedestrian volume of 15. The two-lane profile of Lower Ganges Road provides approximately 90 crossing opportunities per hour based on the future 2030 total volumes (shown in Figure 3.1).

As shown in Figure 3.2, the crossing opportunity value of 90 crossing opportunities in conjunction with the Lower Ganges Road cross section and anticipated crossing volume results in the location being on the cusp of warranting a Signed and Marked Crosswalk.

A Signed and Marked Crosswalk is defined as: Pedestrian crossing is permitted at marked and signed crosswalks. Marked crosswalks are installed to draw a driver's attention to a crossing location and to indicate to pedestrians that the location is a good place to cross the road.
A Special Crosswalk is defined as: Special crosswalks also draw a driver’s attention to the needs of the pedestrians at the crosswalk. They are push button operated and usually reserved for more complex locations where a driver’s attention may be difficult to obtain with a signed and marked crosswalk.

In essence a Special Crosswalk has pedestrian activation buttons, a Signed and Marked Crosswalk does not.
Exhibit 3.6
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Figure 3.1: Pedestrian Crossing Control Warrant – Crossing Opportunities

Figure 3.2: Pedestrian Crossing Control Warrant Chart
The potential crosswalk location at the Blain Road and Lower Ganges Road intersection is 200 m from the Crofton Road crosswalk which is provided as a minimum acceptable distance from another crossing. Due to the following factors we conclude that the introduction of a Special Crosswalk should be considered at this location:

- Special Crosswalk (with push-button activation) versus a Signed and Marked Crosswalk (no push-button activation) is consistent with the nearby Crofton Road crossing allowing for greater pedestrian and motorist predictability;
- High percentage of senior pedestrians;
- Near a hospital;
- Near a school bus stop;
- 200 m from nearest crossing;
- Walking route desire line alignment with services to the south of Lower Ganges Road;
- Continuity with Blain Road pedestrian path;
- Various nearby driveways that may distract driver attention, hence it is considered a complex area as per MoTI Manual definition due to the adjacent shopping area; and,
- If the population of the area was calculated as under 10,000 then a Signed and Marked Crosswalk would be warranted. The population is for the Island as a whole and the immediate area is a relatively low density area therefore it could be argued to be an area with less than 10,000 people.

If existing Lower Ganges Road volumes were used rather than the future ten year growth volumes then the crossing opportunity value would be approximately 135 crossing opportunities which would not warrant a pedestrian crossing treatment. While not technically warranted it is however still considered to be desirable due predominately to the observed existing crossing demand at this location and the close proximity of busy commercial driveways.

In addition to benefitting the proposed development, the recommended Special Crosswalk will also serve an observed existing crossing demand at this location. It will provide improved access to the shopping centre for pedestrians that approach the area from both Blain Road and from the west.
4. PARKING

The vehicle parking bylaw requirements are listed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Vehicle Parking Supply Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>CURRENT ZONING BYLAW RATE</th>
<th>MINIMUM SUPPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Seniors Living</td>
<td>36 dwellings</td>
<td>0.5 per unit plus one per employee (fte)</td>
<td>18 +8 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>5 dwellings</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.25 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Residence</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td>47 m² or 500 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 25 m²</td>
<td>1.9 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>47 m² or 500 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 25 m²</td>
<td>1.9 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>65 m² or 704 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 3.6 m³</td>
<td>18.1 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (new)</td>
<td>464 m² or 5,000 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 32.5 m³</td>
<td>14.1 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (retained)</td>
<td>236 m² or 2,540 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 32.5 m³</td>
<td>7.3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78.4 (78)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed development results in a Bylaw requirement of 78 parking spaces. The development plan proposes 13 spaces beyond the Bylaw requirement.

It is recommended that five parking spaces be reserved for resident visitors; these spaces may be pooled or shared with the commercial and medical office land use parking spaces.

4.1 Bicycle or Mobility Scooter Parking

Secure, accessible and covered scooter and / or bicycle parking will be provided within the parkade structure. The storage room is 22 m² or 239 ft², which is anticipated to accommodate approximately 20 scooters and / or bicycles.

The bylaw requires four bicycle spaces plus an outdoor 6-space bicycle rack. The proposed development therefore exceeds bylaw requirements. Table 4.2 presents the bylaw requirements for bicycle parking.
Table 4.2: Bicycle Parking Supply Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>CURRENT ZONING BYLAW</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>MINIMUM SUPPLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Housing Facilities</td>
<td>51 dwellings</td>
<td>1 per 15 units</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Salon</td>
<td>27 m² or 295 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 250 m²</td>
<td>0.1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>27 m² or 295 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 250 m²</td>
<td>0.1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group</td>
<td>65 m² or 704 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 100 m²</td>
<td>0.65 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (new)</td>
<td>464 m² or 5,000 ft²</td>
<td>1 per 500 m² plus a 6-space rack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office (retained)</td>
<td>236 m² or 2,540 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-space rack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 PLUS A 6 SPACE RACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bunt recommends that the development supply electric outlets in the scooter / bicycle storage room for electric-assisted scooters and / or bicycles.

5. ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

5.1 Site Access & Vehicle Circulation

The development features two driveways on Kings Lane. Both driveways will provide full movement access to Kings Lane. Although the driveways are immediately next to each other, conflicts between exiting vehicles is not anticipated due to the low number of vehicles using the driveways.

5.2 Service Vehicle Access & Circulation

Fire truck access to the site is illustrated in Exhibit 5.1. No conflict points were observed.

All loading will occur at ground floor at the east edge of the site. A SU9 vehicle is the largest vehicle expected to perform loading operations at the proposed building with the majority of service vehicles being smaller. The swept-path analysis for a SU9 vehicle and a garbage collection vehicle entering and exiting the loading area is shown in Exhibit 5.2.
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6. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) seeks to decrease private vehicle use by promoting other more sustainable modes of transportation.

The following elements are proposed as part of the TDM plan intended to further encourage future residents to use more non-single occupant vehicle travel modes, i.e., transit, walking and cycling.

6.1 Infrastructure & Site Design

To promote transit use and walking the proposed development will ensure strong internal pedestrian routes that connect the entry of each building to the external pedestrian network.

6.2 Pedestrian Crossing

The introduction of a Special Crosswalk at the Blain Road intersection will contribute to the area's walkability, and in particular present and future Blain Road and Kings Road residents.

6.3 Shuttle

Bunt recommends the development explore the feasibility of providing a shuttle service to future residents or examine the potential opportunity to share the use of the Greenwoods Eldercare Society shuttle.

6.4 Bicycle/ Scooter Parking

The proposed development proposes bicycle / scooter parking that exceeds Bylaw requirements.
7. SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary

- The proposed Meadowlane development at 154 Kings Lane, Salt Spring Island includes 43 residential units, approximately 159 m² of retail and community group space and 223 m² of new medical office area.

- The traffic operations at the Lower Ganges Road & Blain Road intersection were analyzed for the weekday PM peak hour using summer adjusted vehicle volumes. The intersection currently (2018 summer adjusted volumes) operates within its available capacity with limited delay times during the PM peak hour.

- The proposed development is anticipated to generate approximately 40 to 50 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour period. The applied assumption that the existing medical clinic will be retained results in the total site trip generation of approximately 62 two-way trips per peak hour or one vehicle entering or leaving the site per minute. This 62 trip estimate is considered conservative as it calculates the impact of the medical clinic, hair salon, pharmacy and community group room separately rather than allowing for internal trips between the different land uses. The actual number of vehicle trips generated by the site is likely to be lower than this estimate.

- Vehicles on Blain Road wishing to turn onto Lower Ganges Road encounter LOS B delays during the existing 2018 summer adjusted volume scenario. These delays increase to LOS D during 2030 background (without development) and also 2030 total (with development) scenarios. These delays are within the stated threshold criteria. The increase in delays from 2018 to 2030 are largely the result of background traffic growth (a conservative 2.5% year growth rate was used). The analysis indicates the proposed development will have an indiscernible impact to the operations at the intersection (as evident by comparing the background 2030 and total 2030 scenarios).

- The current bylaw requires a minimum of 78 vehicle parking spaces. The proposed parking supply of 91 parking spaces exceeds Bylaw requirements.

- The development is providing a 22 m² bicycle/ scooter storage room within the parkade structure. It is anticipated to accommodate approximately 20 scooters and / or bicycles which exceeds Bylaw minimum requirements.

- From a transportation perspective the proposed development site is in a favourable location for increased residential density as it is considered to be a walkable area near amenities and is near a major bus route.
Pedestrians were observed to cross Lower Ganges Road at the Blain Road intersection. This demand is anticipated to increase with the introduction of the proposed development.

7.2 Recommendations

- Bunt recommends a Special Crosswalk with pedestrian push-button activation be installed across the east leg of the Lower Ganges Road and Blain Road intersection. The crossing would be similar to the existing crossing treatment at nearby Crofton Road.

- Bunt recommends the development explore the feasibility of providing a shuttle service to future residents or examine the potential opportunity to share the use of the Greenwoods Eldercare Society shuttle.

- It is recommended that a minimum of five parking spaces be reserved for resident visitors; these spaces may be pooled or shared with the commercial land use parking spaces.

- Bunt recommends the development supply electric outlets in the bicycle / scooter storage room for electric-assisted scooters and bicycles.
ATTACHMENT #11 – REFERRAL AGENCIES

LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Lot 2, Section 4, Range 3 East, North Salt Spring Island, Cowichan District, Plan 23507</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>003-106-758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Address</td>
<td>164 Kings Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERRAL AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Referrals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Advisory Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agriculture Advisory Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CRD - Ganges Water &amp; Sewer Commission, Transportation Commission, SSI Building Inspection, SSI Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Island Pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SSI Fire Protection District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Salt Spring Waterworks District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Transportation (site access, circulation, emergency access, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development (Archaeology Branch, Water Authorizations Section, Utility Regulation Section, and Front Counter BC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vancouver Island Health Authority (Drinking Water Protection Act and Regulations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Environment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BC Ambulance Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BC Assessment Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cowichan Valley Regional District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School District 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nation Referrals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cowichan Tribes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Halalt First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lake Cowichan First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lyackson First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Penelakut Tribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stz’uminumus First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malahat First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pauquachin First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tsartlip First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tsawout First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tseycum First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Semiahmoo First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tsawwassen First Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hul’qumi’num Treaty Group (for information only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Te’Mexw Treaty Association (for information only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>