VILLAGE OF SAYWARD
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
December 2, 2025 - 7:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Village of Sayward respectfully acknowledges that the land we gather on is on the unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, the traditional keepers of this land.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Public Input (Maximum of 2 minutes per speaker, 15 minutes total)**

   Mayor: "Public input is for the purpose of permitting people in the gallery to provide feedback and shall be no longer than 15 minutes unless approved by majority vote of Council; each speaker may provide respectful comment on any topic they deem appropriate and not necessarily on the topics on the agenda of the meeting. Each speaker may not speak for longer than 2 minutes but may have a second opportunity if time permits. Each speaker must not be allowed to speak regarding a bylaw in respect of which a public hearing has been held. For the record, please state your name and address."
3. **Introduction of Late Items**
4. **Approval of Agenda**

   Recommended Resolution:

   THAT the agenda for the Regular Meeting of Council for **December 2, 2025**, be approved [as presented **or** as amended].
5. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

   Recommended Resolutions:

   a) THAT the minutes from the **Regular Council Meeting** held on **November 18, 2025**, be adopted [as presented **or** as amended].
6. **Petitions and Delegations – None**
7. **Correspondence**

   Note: Council received the following correspondence with Approval of the Agenda. Council members, however, are welcome to move discussion of any piece/s of correspondence.

   a) Recent documentation and letters concerning proposed Professional Reliance Act

i. Email from George Anderson MLA regarding proposed Professional Reliance Act dated November 14, 2025 with attachments

ii. Briefing Note Q&A re proposed Professional Reliance Act

iii. Homes for Living email dated November 10, 2025 re proposed Professional Reliance Act

iv. UDI-CV Board of Trade letter dated November 14, 2025 re proposed Professional Reliance Act

v. Opinion piece from George Anderson MLA re proposed Professional Reliance Act dated November 5, 2025

vi. UBCM newsletter dated November 19, 2025 encouraging Local Governments to respond to proposed Professional Reliance Act

vii. City of Pitt Meadows letter dated November 26, 2025 expressing concern with proposed Professional Reliance Act

viii. Lidstone & Co bulletin dated November 19, 2025 expressing concern with proposed Professional Reliance Act

ix. Vancouver Sun article dated November 14, 2025 regarding proposed Professional Reliance Act

b) UBCM Small Community Representative letter dated November 20, 2025

c) Media Statement from Village of Sayward and SRD dated November 25, 2025 regarding Water Conservation and Landslide Update (includes photographs of the Newcastle Creek logjam)

8. Council Reports – None

9. Reports of Committees – None

10. Mayor's Report – None

11. Unfinished Business – None

12. Staff Reports

a) Council Procedure Bylaw 416-2015 Amendment

i. Report to Council - Amendment to Bylaw 416, 2015 Council Procedure Bylaw

ii. Bylaw 518-2026 Council Procedure Bylaw Amendment

iii. Public Notice to Amend Bylaw 416-2015 Council Procedure Bylaw

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council Procedure Amendment Bylaw No. 518, 2026 be given first, second, and third reading.

2. THAT Staff post notice of the proposed amendment on the Village's public notice board, in the January 2026 Sayward News, on the Village website, and on the Village's Facebook page; and,
3. THAT staff provide Council with a summary of any public comments received on the proposed amendment before final adoption.

b) Sayward Royal Canadian Legion (RCL) Service Agreement - Share Shed

i. Report to Council – Sayward RCL Service Agreement - Share Shed

ii. Draft Service Agreement – Share Shed 2026

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council approves the renewal of the Share Shed Service Agreement between the Village of Sayward and the Sayward Royal Canadian Legion for two (2) years starting January 1, 2026; and
2. THAT Council authorizes the Mayor and Corporate Officer to execute the Share Shed Service Agreement on behalf of the Village.

c) Sayward News Re-Imagined

i. Report to Council – Sayward News Re-Imagined

ii. Bylaw 451 – Fees and Charges – Appendix A General Administration

iii. Bylaw 451 – Fees and Charges Amendment – Appendix B Sayward News

iv. G.Whalley email re Sayward News – possible new model

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council approves the proposed adjustments to the content and distribution of the Sayward News as described in this report to Council.

d) Financial Plan 2026-2030

i. Report to Council – Financial Plan 2026-2030

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council schedule the following dates for Committee of the Whole meetings for Financial Planning purposes:
   Tuesday, February 3, 2026, at 6 pm
   Tuesday, February 17, 2026, at 6 pm
   Tuesday, March 3, 2026, at 6 pm

e) Financial Projection to December 31, 2025

i. Report to Council – Financial Projection to December 31, 2025

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council approves the following amendments to the 2025-2029 Financial Plan:
    a. Deferment of the 2025 capital reserve transfers for water and sewer.
    b. A transfer of up to $80,000 from the Growing Communities Fund Reserve for equipment purchases in 2025.
    c. The use of unappropriated surplus for any remaining deficit in 2025.
2. THAT Council direct staff to prepare a Revenue Anticipation Bylaw for 2026 for Council consideration.

f) Revenue Anticipation Bylaw

i. Report to Council – Revenue Anticipation Bylaw
ii. Bylaw 517 – Revenue Anticipation Bylaw 2026

Recommended Resolution/s

1. THAT Council gives first, second, and third reading to Revenue Anticipation Bylaw No. 517, 2026; and
2. THAT Council authorizes the Mayor and Chief Financial Officer to sign the necessary forms to procure short-term financing from the Municipal Finance Authority.

13. Emergency Services/Public Works/Recreation Department Reports - None

14. Bylaws – None

15. New Business – None

16. Public Question Period (maximum 15 minutes)

Mayor: "The purpose of the public question period is to enable citizens to ask questions of Council about issues that are important to the citizen asking the question. Speakers are asked to limit their questions to one each and, if time permits after everyone has had an opportunity to ask questions, speakers may ask a second question. Citizens will be asked to state their name and address."

17. In Camera

Recommended Resolution:

THAT in accordance with Section 92 of the Community Charter, this Council meeting will be closed to the public at this time in order that Council may give consideration to matters in accordance with the following sections of the Community Charter:

1. 90(1)(a) personal information about an identifiable individual who holds or is being considered for a position as an officer, employee or agent of the municipality or another position appointed by the municipality;
2. 90(1)(c) labour relations or other employee relations;

3. 90(1)(d) security of the property of the municipality;
4. 90(1)(i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;
5. 90(1)(j) information that is prohibited, or information that if it were presented in a document would be prohibited, from disclosure under section 21 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

18. Adjournment

a) THAT the Village of Sayward Council adjourns its December 2, 2025 Regular Meeting.

Time: _____ .

VILLAGE OF SAYWARD
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
November 18, 2025
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Village of Sayward respectfully acknowledges that the land we gather on is on the unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, the traditional keepers of this land.

Present: Mayor Mark Baker
Councillor Scott Burchett
Councillor Debbie Coates (via Teams)
Councillor Jason Johnson
Councillor Sue Poulsen (via Teams)

In Attendance: Andrew Young, CAO/CO
Lisa Clark, Chief Financial Officer
Jennifer Redshaw, Office Administrator

1. **Call to Order**

   The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

2. **Public Input**

   a) Milena Gradisar of 221 Ambleside stated that she presented a letter to staff and Council at the last council meeting and has not received a response yet.

3. **Introduction of Late Items - None**

4. **Approval of Agenda**

   MOTION R25/282
   MOVED AND SECONDED
   THAT the agenda for the Regular Meeting of Council for **November 18, 2025**, be approved as presented.

   CARRIED

5. **Minutes of Previous Meetings**

   MOTION R25/283
   MOVED AND SECONDED
   THAT the minutes from the **Regular Council Meeting** held on **November 4, 2025**, be adopted as presented.

   CARRIED

6. Petitions and Delegations – None

7. Correspondence

a) Email from Honourable Jodie Wickens, Minister of Children and Family Development dated October 31, 2025 proclaiming November as Adoption and Permanency Awareness Month.

b) Strathcona Regional District (SRD) launches FireSmart Homeowners Rebate Program for Village of Sayward

MOTION R25/284
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT staff investigate whether the 50/50 program replaces the former brush clean-up program and report back to council.

Opposed Cllr Burchett **CARRIED**

c) Managed Forest Council Annual Report 2024-2025 – dated October 31, 2025

d) Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM) Preliminary Findings – Proposed Changes to Heritage Conservation Act (HCA) – dated November 5, 2025

8. Council Reports – None

9. Reports of Committees – None

10. Mayor's Report - None

11. Unfinished Business – None

12. Staff Reports

a) Grant in Aid Request – BC Emergency Health Services (BCEHS)

MOTION R25/285
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT Council approves the grant in aid request from the BC Emergency Health Services – Community Paramedic to host a weekly chair exercise class for seniors with mobility issues at the Kelsey Recreation Centre dated November 10, 2025, as amended.

CARRIED

The amendments were to extend access to the Kelsey Recreation Centre Multi-Purpose Room to 9:30am - 11:30am and that a door fob be provided with the deposit waived.

b) Budget Variance Report – as of October 2025

The Budget Variance Report was received by Council as part of the agenda package for information purposes. Council made no decisions respecting the information contained in this report.

c) Appointments to Committees and Boards

MOTION R25/286
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT Council re-affirms the current appointments of members of Sayward Council to Committees and Boards within and outside the Village of Sayward for the remainder of the current Sayward Council's term.

Opposed Cllr Burchett CARRIED

d) Proposed Regular Council Meeting Dates for 2026

MOTION R25/287
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT Council adopts a Regular Meeting Schedule for 2026, following the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month.

Opposed Cllr Burchett, Cllr Poulsen CARRIED

13. Emergency Services/Public Works/Recreation Department Reports – None

14. Bylaws – None

15. New Business – None

16. Public Question Period

a) Maureen Haslehurst of 520 MacMillan Drive quoted Section 8.4 of Council Procedure Bylaw No.416 (as amended) regarding electronic meetings. Ms. Haslehurst said she had not seen a resolution allowing electronic attendance by councillors.

Mayor Baker stated that he provides approval of electronic attendance.

17. In Camera

MOTION R25/288
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT in accordance with Section 92 of the Community Charter, this Council meeting will be closed to the public at this time in order that Council may give consideration to matters in accordance with the following sections of the Community Charter:

1. 90(1)(d) security of the property of the municipality;
2. 90(1)(f) law enforcement, if the council considers that disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm the conduct of an investigation under or enforcement of an enactment;
3. 90(1)(g) litigation or potential litigation affecting the municipality;
4. 90(1)(i) the receipt of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;
5. 90(1)(j) information that is prohibited, or information that if it were presented in a document would be prohibited, from disclosure under section 21 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act;
6. 90(1)(l) discussions with municipal officers and employees respecting municipal objectives, measures and progress reports for the purposes of preparing an annual

report under section 98 [annual municipal report].

Opposed Cllr Burchett, Cllr Poulsen **CARRIED**

18. Adjournment

MOTION R25/289
MOVED AND SECONDED
THAT the Village of Sayward Council adjourns its November 18, 2025 Regular Meeting.

Time and Date: 8:46 pm, Tuesday, November 18, 2025.

CARRIED

_____ _____

Mayor Corporate Officer

From:	Anderson, George
Cc:	Anderson.MLA, George
Subject:	Working together, the Professional Reliance Act
Date:	November 14, 2025 1:17:27 PM
Attachments:	Briefing Note and Q&A - Professional Reliance Act (2).pdf Homes for Living.pdf 2025-11-14 UDI-GVBOT Joint Letter - Bill M 216 Professional Reliance Act.pdf Professional Reliance Act - FIN (GA).pdf

---

Dear Mayors & Councillors,

My name is George Anderson. I am the MLA for Nanaimo-Lantzville.

Recently, I tabled a Private Members Bill M 216 *Professional Reliance Act.* The goal of the *Act* is to uplift the work that is already occurring in British Columbia.

Several municipalities, such as the City of Prince George, Town of Ladysmith, City of Surrey, and many others across British Columbia already utilize professional reliance or a certified professional program.

On November 6, 2025, I met with the Union of British Columbia President Cori Ramsey and Executive Director MacIsaac regarding the bill, and I am hopeful that UBCM and I can work together to deliver what British Columbians expect of us.

Attached to this email you will find the following:

- A briefing note on the bill, with a Q&A fact sheet;
- A letter of Support from Homes for Living a Non-Profit based in Victoria; and
- A Joint Letter of Support signed by the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade and Urban Development Institute.

Lastly, you will find an op-ed that I've written titled "British Columbia can Build the Homes we need faster, if We Trust the People Who know how to build them." It makes the case for reform that lets municipalities accept certified work from provincially regulated professionals to accelerate housing approvals without lowering standards. Moreover, the piece uses examples of where this practice is already in place in British Columbia, such as in Vancouver, Surrey, the town of Ladysmith, and City of Prince George.

Lastly, I have included a few articles on the bill:

https://www.beautifulnanaimo.ca/posts/2025/11/01/bill-m216

https://businessexaminer.ca/victoria-articles/item/editorial-professional-reliance-act-could-speed-up-home-building-significantly/

https://nanaimobulletin.com/2025/10/30/nanaimo-lantzville-mla-introduces-bill-to-streamline-housing-approvals/

As a former City Councillor and Regional District Director, I have tremendous respect

for the work that all of you do to build our communities.

If you have suggestions on how we can make this bill work for your community, please do not hesitate to reach out to my office to set up a meeting or send your comments directly to me.
Sincerely,

George

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
of BRITISH COLUMBIA

George A.G. Anderson | MLA, Nanaimo – Lantzville
g.anderson@leg.bc.ca
Follow us on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram |

Briefing Note re: Professional Reliance Act

Prepared by: MLA George Anderson, Nanaimo - Lantzville

RE: ***Professional Reliance Act***

Purpose: To strengthen local government capacity, accelerate housing approvals, and reduce costs by trusting qualified professionals under existing provincial regulation.

Overview

British Columbia needs to build housing and community infrastructure faster without compromising safety or accountability.

Right now, many local governments are required to re-review the technical work of provincially licensed professionals (engineers, architects, etc.), even though those professionals are already accountable under the *Professional Governance Act* (PGA).

This duplication drains staff time, delays housing, and increases costs for families and local taxpayers.

The *Professional Reliance Act* fixes that.

It allows municipalities to **accept certified work from qualified professionals** and move projects forward faster, freeing up staff for community planning and public engagement.

Key Benefits

For young people:

- More homes coming to market sooner, making home ownership and renting more attainable.

For families:

- A better chance to find or own a home in the community they love.

For local governments:

- Less red tape, more capacity, and reduced administrative costs.

For taxpayers:

- Savings on staff duplication and lower development costs over time.

How It Works

- If a professional certified under the *Professional Governance Act* (PGA) seals their work, local governments can accept it without a second technical peer review.
- The professional remains fully liable and accountable through their regulatory body (Architectural Institute of British Columbia, Engineers and Geoscientist of British Columbia, etc.).
- Municipalities maintain control over zoning, design guidelines, and policy decisions — this reform only streamlines *technical* approvals.
- Disputes between professionals can be referred to the Office of the Superintendent of Professional Governance (OSPG).

What It's Not

- Not privatization - accountability stays public through OSPG oversight.
- Not deregulation - standards stay the same. The process just becomes faster.
- Not a download to municipalities. Simply a reduction in administrative pressure.

Q&A Sheet – *Professional Reliance Act*

Q1: Why is this bill needed?

A: Many housing projects are delayed because local governments have to re-review work already completed by licensed professionals.

This duplication adds time, costs, and frustration. The bill modernizes that process so projects move faster and local governments can focus on planning great communities.

Q2: Will this reduce oversight or lower standards?

A: No. Professionals are still regulated, insured, and accountable under the *Professional Governance Act* and the Office of the Superintendent of Professional Governance. Oversight remains public and strong.

Q3: How does this help housing affordability?

A: Every month of delay adds cost. Both for builders and, eventually, for families. By removing redundant steps, we reduce those costs and get homes to market faster.

Q4: Does this take power away from local governments?

A: No. Local councils still decide zoning, design, and land-use policy. The *Act* streamlines technical review so staff can focus on community priorities instead of paperwork.

Q5: How does this help smaller municipalities?

A: Smaller towns often struggle to hire engineers or architects for peer review. This bill saves them those costs and lets them rely on provincially regulated professionals instead.

Q6: Is this a "developer giveaway"?

A: No. Developers still meet all local requirements and hire qualified, accountable professionals. The difference is that cities won't waste months re-checking certified work.

Q7: What about unionized staff in local governments?

A: This bill doesn't eliminate positions; it helps municipal staff focus on higher-value work like long-term planning, housing strategy, and public consultation.

Q8: Is this costly to implement?

A: No. It uses existing provincial structures under the *Professional Governance Act* and the OSPG. Local governments may make small bylaw or process adjustments, but the overall effect is cost-saving.

Q9: What about RidgeView Place in Langford? Couldn't this potentially lead to more of that?

A: The issues at Ridgeview Place occurred under the existing system and partially informed this bill.

This bill would make it clear that the professionals remain fully liable and accountable through their regulatory body. Further clarifying that local governments will not be liable for the actions of certified professionals.

Q10: Are there any other municipalities using this model or Professional Reliance?

A: Yes, there are several certified professional programs in British Columbia, for example:

*City of Vancouver	*City of Surrey
*City of Burnaby	* District of Squamish
*District of West Vancouver	*City of Maple Ridge
*Town of Ladysmith	*City of Abbotsford
* City of Prince George	

Anderson.MLA, George

From: Homes For Living <hello@homesforliving.ca>
Sent: November 10, 2025 9:59 PM
To: Homes For Living
Subject: Support for Bill B216 - Professional Reliance Act

Dear Member of the Legislative Assembly,

Homes for Living supports a move towards increasing reliance on qualified professionals to streamline building permits in urban areas, and supports Member Bill M216, the *Professional Reliance Act.*

Homes for Living is a community housing advocacy group, made up of volunteers concerned about the housing crisis in the Capital Regional District. The region has a dire housing shortage, with housing completions falling well short of what is needed to achieve broad affordability. The shortage is driven by zoning codes that make new multifamily housing illegal, high fees on new housing, and lengthy permitting timelines that means that families can only move into new housing years after it is first proposed by a proponent.

These challenges are most acute in built-up urban areas, such as the City of Victoria, where infill housing is both the most sustainable and cost-effective type of new housing, but also the most difficult, expensive, and time-consuming to build. To meet affordability goals, we must ensure that it is faster and easier to build dense infill housing rather than suburban sprawl.

The changes proposed by Bill M216, the *Professional Reliance Act*, would help alleviate one aspect of this challenge. While additional, substantial reforms are needed to ensure that municipal zoning is not a constraint on new housing, reducing approval timelines after a project receives zoning approval is also critical. We have received feedback from developers that the process and degree of inspections and verifications varies widely between CRD municipalities, with some trusting professionals to do their due diligence, while others require duplicative review and inspection of projects that are certified by an applicant's Architect and Engineers.

We would submit that infill housing is a good candidate for a consistent Professional Reliance framework. Infill housing is typically built in areas with no or minimal environmental concerns (environmental engineering being an area with past concerns about Professional Reliance approaches). It should be noted that similar frameworks have been adopted in other jurisdictions where quickly building housing is a priority. For instance, the County of LA implemented a pilot self-reliance approval process that allowed builders of certain categories of homes to self-certify that their home designs meet code.

Best regards,

The Homes for Living team

ABOUT HOMES FOR LIVING: We are a community housing advocacy group, made up of volunteers concerned about the housing crisis in the capital region. Homes for Living is advocating for more homes through policy reform to make Victoria more affordable for people across the income and housing needs spectrum. We are a volunteer-funded non-profit, and our voting members cannot be developers, politicians, or their relatives.

More: https://homesforliving.ca/about-us

Homes for

November 14, 2025

Hon. George Anderson
MLA, Nanaimo-Lantzville
George.Anderson.MLA@leg.bc.ca

RE: Support for Bill M 216 – Professional Reliance Act

Dear Mr. Anderson,

On behalf of the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade (GVBOT) and the Urban Development Institute (UDI), we wish to express our support for the intent of *Bill M 216 – Professional Reliance Act.*

This proposed legislation will help address a major concern of the development community by recognizing the importance of improving the efficiency and predictability of the development approvals process across British Columbia. Expediting the development approvals process by reducing redundancies in the review process, while upholding the professional standards of qualified professionals (QPs), is another regulatory tool which would support the more timely delivery of new homes for British Columbians who need more housing options.

A significant portion of the cost to build a new home is attributed to government-imposed measures – whether it be fees, long review processes, or new requirements. Of particular concern is rising construction costs, which are being largely driven by building code requirements. One builder recently reviewed their project proformas over the past 15 years, which revealed that construction costs have soared to over $562.59 per square foot – up from under $204.19 per square foot. This is well beyond the Consumer Price Index rate of inflation. These costs ultimately fall to homebuyers and renters, compounding the affordability crisis across the province.

This professional reliance initiative comes at a time when the cost of delivering new homes has reached a breaking point. Higher construction costs, increased interest rates, and government fees combined with lengthy approval timelines make it increasingly difficult to bring new housing to market that homebuyers and renters can afford.

As has been noted in the debate on *Bill M 216,* municipalities already depend extensively on QPs to support the development approval process, and the proposed framework recognizes that work in a constructive and transparent way. For example, the municipalities of Vancouver, Burnaby, and Surrey all utilize a Certified Professionals

Program for the issuance of Building Permits. These programs would be enhanced through this legislation, by ensuring the original purpose of the programs (rapid permit issuance through professional review and reliance) are achieved.

The *Professional Reliance Act* offers an opportunity to apply those learnings province-wide, so that all communities can benefit from timely growth and responsible oversight. That said, there may have to be regulatory powers that differentiate between technical and urban design-related Development Permit requirements. Where technical requirements are definitive, urban design-related requirements require a more nuanced by nature and may be better suited for review by local governments.

Some additional issues for consideration at the Committee stage include:

- Ensuring the legislation applies to the City of Vancouver, which is under the *Vancouver Charter*;
- Ensuring the legislation applies to all trade permits, such as sprinklers, plumbing, and electrical permits;
- Instead of relying on the Superintendent for dispute resolution, move this task to the regulated professions (e.g. Engineers and Geoscientists of BC, Architectural Institute of BC); and
- Ensuring the legislation is coordinated with the *Building Act*.

Our organizations want more British Columbians to have more housing options available to them. Establishing a more consistent, streamlined, and professionally informed process will help support more timely approvals for new housing supply by reducing the uncertainty, risks, and carrying costs that currently delay projects and reduce affordability. We encourage all MLAs to pass *Bill M 216*, and would be pleased to discuss in greater detail as this makes its way through the legislative process

Sincerely,

Bridgitte Anderson
President and CEO
Greater Vancouver Board of Trade

Anne McMullin
President and CEO
Urban Development Institute

Opinion: British Columbia can Build the Homes we need faster, if We Trust the people who know how to build them

By George Anderson, MLA for Nanaimo–Lantzville

Date: November 5, 2025

British Columbia is at a crossroads where the urgency of the moment around housing meets the opportunity to do things differently. Across the province from Nanaimo to Prince George, to Coquitlam, to Vernon: people want homes built faster, communities planned better, and governments that deliver.

However, our ability to build homes can be trapped in a process that mistakes repetition for rigour. Across the province, housing projects sit waiting not for financing or workers, but for busy municipal staff to recheck the work that has been completed by qualified professionals.

This isn't due to mistakes or distrust, but instead because the system of approvals hasn't kept up to meet the needs of community.

Right now, we have reached a point where delay is the most expensive material in construction. As a former City Councillor and Commercial lawyer at one of Canda's largest law firms, I have witnessed this firsthand.

That's why on October 21, 2025, as a private member, I introduced the *Professional Reliance Act*. A reform designed to move housing approvals from backlog to breakthrough.

The premise is simple: when a provincially regulated professional, such as an architect or engineer, certifies their work that certification should stand. These individuals are licensed under the *Professional Governance Act*, accountable to the Province, and insured for the public interest.

Under this proposed legislation, local governments across BC would be empowered to accept certified work with confidence instead of double checking the work which causes an extensive backlog. The accountability remains, but it rests where the expertise already exists.

Some people might wonder whether or not this approach can be done. However, this approach is already working in multiple municipalities in British Columbia. In Vancouver, the Certified Professional Program facilitates the issuance of building permits for new or existing buildings, thereby allowing construction to start earlier. Certified professionals are trusted to sign off on specific design and structural components, expediting reviews without compromising safety.

In Surrey, a fast-growing city on track to becoming the largest city in British Columbia, managing thousands of permits annually, utilizes professional reliance principles to streamline engineering and building applications, giving staff more capacity to focus on infrastructure planning.

In Prince George, a smaller municipality, a professional reliance building permit stream allows certified experts to take responsibility for technical submissions. This process saves both time and taxpayer resources while maintaining full public oversight.

The *Professional Reliance Act* builds on the successful approaches already taken by Local Governments and extends them province-wide.

This is <u>not</u> deregulation. This bill demonstrates trust through structure creating a framework where local governments retain control over zoning, land-use planning, and design, while relying on professional certification to move projects forward faster.

The result: British Columbians keep what we value: safety, public accountability, and professional standards. Removing what we can no longer afford: unnecessary duplication, months of delay, and rising costs that push homes further out of reach for everyday people.

When housing approval drags on, the cost doesn’t disappear. Every day, month, and year of delay is passed down to: renters, first-time buyers, and to families who are saying their hopes for stability fade a little more with every delay.

For young people, this bill provides the hope of homes coming to market sooner.

For families, this bill provides hope of a better chance to own a place in the community they love.

For local governments, this bill means more results, less red tape, and the capacity to serve British Columbians more efficiently.

For British Columbia's economy, this bill means aligning the skills of professionals, skilled trades, and planners toward a common shared goal of building together.

Lastly, housing is a non-partisan issue. As legislators, regardless of our political stripes, we want to achieve the same goal of ensuring British Columbians can afford homes, work in their community, and live a good life. Through this bill we can demonstrate that when legislators put outcomes ahead of ideology, we can show good governance allowing British Columbia to thrive.

My hope in introducing the Professional Reliance Act is start a conversation about how we realize our potential as a province.

British Columbia is a province defined by ambition. British Columbia leads in clean technology, innovation, and sustainable development. However, leadership means matching our vision with velocity, aligning our systems with the urgency British Columbians feel, and ensuring our systems match our ambition.

Should the bill become law, it will be a signal that in British Columbia we still believe in what is possible.

We can build faster without cutting corners.

We can build smarter without losing oversight.

And we can build a province where young people see their future, not their exit.

When we create the conditions to build easier and smarter, we make it easier to belong.

That's what British Columbians expect and deserve.

And that's what this legislation delivers.

UBCM encourages local government response to Bill M216

Publishing Date: November 19, 2025

The Professional Reliance Act bill (M216) threatens to weaken the oversight of new home construction and increase the liability risk of taxpayers

A private member's bill that poses significant risks to new homeowners and taxpayers passed second reading earlier this week. *Bill M216 – Professional Reliance Act*, sponsored by NDP MLA George Anderson would remove the ability of local governments to review development proposals, and instead allow professionals hired by developers to certify their projects. The bill will now proceed to review by the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills. A **portal** is available for submissions to the committee. The committee has agreed to UBCM's request to extend the period for input. Sumissions can be made until January 6, 2026. [The original deadline was December 2, 2025.] Local governments are encouraged to provide comments there and communicate directly with MLA **George Anderson**, Minister **Christine Boyle**, and Minister of State **Brittny Anderson**.

If adopted, Bill M216 would prohibit local governments from requiring a standard technical peer review during housing development applications. Instead, local governments would be required to accept any

certified submission of a registered professional (in accordance with the *Professional Governance Act*) hired by the developer. If passed, any local government that disputed the submission would have to appeal the certification with the Office of the Superintendent for Professional Guidance.

UBCM's Concerns

UBCM provided a preliminary **analysis** of Bill M216 identifying unanswered questions when the bill was first introduced. In addition to these initial questions, UBCM has identified the following concerns:

- **If passed into law, Bill M216 would effectively deregulate a core element of the development approval process**. Local government staff commonly identify deficiencies in applications that have been certified by a registered professional and provided by developers. By removing peer review that is integral to common current process, these deficiencies are more likely to be missed, putting the eventual homeowner at risk of unexpected cost and safety issues.
- **Bill M216 is a recipe for slowing down development approvals.** Under the current process, local governments can work with development applicants to identify and address deficiencies. If Bill M216 is brought into law, local governments would have to make an appeal to the Office of the Superintendent for Professional Guidance if they had concerns with a submission. Given the volume of issues that arise during development approvals, this will create a significant bottleneck and slow down the overall approval process for deficient projects. The Office would need to become larger to address demand – increasing rather than reducing bureaucracy and centralizing it far from impacted communities.
- **Bill M216 will create liability concerns for local governments, and by extension, property taxpayers:** If defects emerge during the lifespan of a given building or infrastructure asset, it is unclear who would bear the true costs. If the certified professional in question is unavailable to be held accountable or is underinsured, affected residents, tenants, businesses and

local governments may find themselves with limited recourse to seek reparations for damages. Despite the claim made within the bill that local governments will not be liable for damages, that will not prevent an injured party from naming a local government in its claim. It also remains unclear whether local governments would still owe a duty of care under the proposed bill.

- **Bill M216 is not innovative**. The bill is being described as enabling an innovative approach to cutting red-tape, when in fact local governments already are enabled to adopt a professional reliance model for specific purposes. What this bill would do is mandate the model to all local governments across the Province, applying it as a one-size fits all approach regardless of local context, while stripping away critical checks and balances, like peer review.
- **Bill M216 was created in a vacuum**. It is not clear whom MLA Anderson spoke to in developing the bill, but the net result is a bill of sweeping scope that lacks nuance and real-world ground truthing. Unintended consequences are likely to result.

A vocal opposition to Bill M216 is developing, as noted in these **Vancouver Sun** and **CBC** articles. Earlier this week, the **Okanagan Basin Water Board** shared its concerns with UBCM. We also understand that several local governments are preparing correspondence.

We will continue to monitor the progress of Bill M216 as it moves toward review by the Standing Committee and will share further analysis in the coming weeks.

Tags
UBCM News

Home > **About the UBCM** > **Latest News**
> UBCM encourages local government response to Bill M216

City of Pitt Meadows

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

November 26, 2025 File: 01-0400-20/25

Honourable Christine Boyle
Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs
Email: HMA.Minister@gov.bc.ca

Dear Minister Boyle,

Re: Concerns Regarding Bill M 216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act

On behalf of Pitt Meadows City Council, I am writing to express our concerns with Bill M 216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act. We understand that the intent of the Bill is to streamline approvals and reduce administrative costs for development. The approach proposed in this legislation, however, is likely to have the opposite effect and create unnecessary risks to both human and environmental health.

Bill M 216 mandates that a local government must accept any submission by a certifying professional (e.g., an architect, engineer, agrologist or environmental consultant) as part of a development approval process. It also prohibits a local government from requiring a peer review of those submissions. As a result, Bill M 216 significantly reduces local government oversight over development projects. This will negatively affect public safety and create new liability for the City and, by extension, local taxpayers.

The City of Pitt Meadows, like many local governments, has been working to improve development approval processes in alignment with local and provincial housing goals, while maintaining public safety and environmental sustainability. We support improvements to the development approval process, but efficiencies cannot come at the expense of due diligence, public health and informed local decision-making. Many certifying professionals, despite their expertise, may not be familiar with local conditions, City bylaws, development permit guidelines, and floodplain requirements, or other community-specific regulations, which is a key reason why local government reviews are essential to ensure accuracy and compliance. Local review processes benefit the public

by helping build safer and more sustainable neighbourhoods that reflect community needs and protect the environment over the long-term.

Challenges with the Professional Reliance Model

Reviewing building and infrastructure plans to safeguard public safety, the natural environment and local agriculture is an important role of local government. As part of these processes, our City staff frequently identify errors in plans and reports prepared by certifying professionals. We also note that these professionals often face pressure from their clients to sign-off on projects quickly and within budget.

In addition, while used infrequently, peer reviews can be an important part of the process to reduce risk and mitigate errors, particularly for more complex developments or projects with greater safety and environmental hazards. Under Bill M 216, these critical local safeguards are weakened, if not eliminated. Oversight responsibility shifts from the public sector—where it is transparent and democratically accountable—to the private sector, where the primary duty is to the client rather than the broader community.

Bill M 216 contradicts extensive evidence that demonstrates the limitations and failures of professional reliance. In 2018, the Province received a report on professional reliance in the natural resource sector that explicitly warned of "significant gaps in professional reliance models" and "substandard professional work."[1] The report noted various high-profile environmental incidents, including the Mount Polley Tailings Storage Facility breach and the contamination of the Hullcar Aquifer, that had drawn public scrutiny and brought to light decreased confidence in professional reliance regulatory regimes. The report noted that when government cannot request information or verify compliance, it "loses its ability to prevent harm from occurring and is left only with enforcement tools after harm has occurred."

While we understand that changes to the professional reliance framework were made in response to this 2018 report (e.g., the enactment of the Professional Governance Act and establishment of the office of the superintendent of professional governance), these changes were not intended to replace government review and oversight.

To that end, a 2022 report from the Ombudsperson on the Riparian Areas Protection Regulation found persistent non-compliance, high rejection rates and a need for greater

[1] Professional Reliance Review: The Final Report of the Review of Professional Reliance in Natural Resource Decision-Making (professionalgovernancebc.ca/app/uploads/sites/498/2019/05/Professional_Reliance_Review_Final_Report.pdf)

government oversight of qualified professionals.[2] The report stated that the effectiveness and accountability of the riparian regulation depend on qualified professionals following regulatory requirements. It also noted that, due to ongoing deficiencies, the Province has had to review all submissions from these professionals.

This highlights a clear and deeply concerning contradiction: professional reliance has been shown to require more oversight at the provincial level, yet Bill M 216 shifts the professional reliance model onto local governments without the safeguards the Province itself determined were necessary.

Liability for Local Governments and Taxpayers

Local government reviews of building and infrastructure plans help to prevent safety issues, environmental damage, infrastructure failures and costly problems in the future. If local governments are required to accept professionally certified plans, including plans for City infrastructure provided through development, significant errors and deficiencies may go undetected. This introduces significant and unacceptable risks for local governments and taxpayers who would be left with the cost of resolving any deficiencies, particularly if the professional, or their company, is unavailable to be held accountable.

Although Bill M 216 states that local governments will not be liable for damages caused by professional certification, legal experts have advised that, in the context of existing case law, the City would still carry liability where a builder, owner, subcontractor or qualified professional is dissolved or insolvent. The attempt in Bill M 216 to protect local governments from liability, furthermore, does not prevent a party from naming the City in its claim, and the City would be required to go through a costly court process to be removed from the action.

Inefficiencies and Processing Delays

It appears that the only remedy available under Bill M 216 to a local government who is concerned about the quality or accuracy of a professional certification is to refer the matter to the provincial Superintendent of Professional Governance for dispute resolution.

The Superintendent of Professional Governance is an office established by the Professional Governance Act to provide oversight of professional regulators. The office focuses on professional regulation, not the subject matter expertise applied by regulated

[2] Final Report on the Implementation of Recommendations from Striking a Balance: The Challenges of Using a Professional Reliance Model in Environmental Protection – British Columbia's Riparian Areas Regulation (bcombudsperson.ca/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/StrikingABalance-Report-Jan5.pdf)

professionals. The Superintendent does not employ experts who could settle a dispute between two or more professionals about the technical aspects of a development proposal.

Requiring the Superintendent to resolve potential disputes from the 161 municipalities and 27 regional districts across the Province will almost certainly lead to increased inefficiencies and processing delays, exacerbating the very issue Bill M 216 seeks to address.

Loss of Local Knowledge and Authority

Bill M 216 shifts decision-making away from local governments, and places greater authority in the hands of private professionals. Additionally, shifting dispute resolution to the Superintendent of Professional Governance means moving responsibility away from those most familiar with the local geography and community dynamics. Instead, it places it with a provincial government office that would have no such knowledge or understanding.

Bill M 216 exemplifies the ongoing and concerning shift in decision-making powers from local governments to a centralized provincial authority. This shift is eroding the essential role of locally grounded knowledge—which is fundamental to ensuring developments fit their context, respect environmental constraints and meet the unique needs of the community.

Lack of Clarity and Consideration of other Legislation

Many aspects of Bill M 216, including its relationship to existing legislation that governs development approval processes, remain unclear. For example, it is not clear whether the requirement to accept professional submissions would apply to development permit approvals under the *Local Government Act*. Additionally, it is unclear how Bill M 216 might impact the matters to be considered by an approving officer for subdivision under the *Land Title Act.*

We understand that Bill M 216 has not benefited from the input of provincial staff, who could probably assist provincial elected officials in identifying additional concerns with Bill M 216, and its implications for other provincial legislation.

Absence of Consultation with Local Governments

The City of Pitt Meadows was not consulted prior to the introduction of Bill M 216, nor, as we understand, were any of our local government colleagues across the province. Significant legislative changes affecting development, land use and municipal authority

must be developed collaboratively with local governments. Meaningful consultation is essential to avoid unintended consequences and ensure legislation achieves its stated goals.

In closing, the City of Pitt Meadows supports efforts to reduce duplication, improve timeliness and accelerate housing delivery. However, these goals must be achieved through collaborative, evidence-based approaches that do not weaken local government oversight and create public safety concerns.

We urge the provincial government to reconsider this Bill and engage directly with municipalities before moving forward with changes that fundamentally alter local land use authority and the development process.

Sincerely,

Nicole MacDonald
Mayor, City of Pitt Meadows

cc: Pitt Meadows City Council

Mark Roberts, CAO

David Eby, Premier of British Columbia

Brittny Anderson, Minister of State for Local Governments and Rural Communities

Lisa Beare, MLA for Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows

George Anderson, MLA for Nanaimo-Lantzville

Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills

BC Municipalities & Regional Districts

Councillor Cori Ramsay, Union of BC Municipalities President

Councillor Paul Albrecht, LMLGA President

LIDSTONE & COMPANY
BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

BULLETIN

TO: **Clients**
FROM: **Lidstone & Company**
DATE: **November 19, 2025**
RE: **Bill M216, 2025**
FILE: **99999 - 012**

Bill M216–2025 has recently been introduced in the provincial legislature (First Reading October 21 and Second Reading November 17). If enacted, the law would impact local government powers, responsibilities, and liability, obligating local governments to approve permit or bylaw applications in accordance with the judgement of a wide category of professionals rather than the existing "qualified professionals" or local government's own discretion. The sudden changes could affect health and safety of persons and buildings and environmental protection, contrary to the provincial regime that has been in place for decades under various governments. The scheme would create significant delays and extra costs for developers in the development process in BC. It creates new liability for local governments, and predictably higher insurance costs for homeowners and businesses. This bulletin summarizes some potential impacts on local governments.

1. **Professional Reliance**

Currently under sections s. 55 and s. 56 of the *Community Charter*, local governments **may** (but are not required to) obligate building permit applicants to provide certificates from a "qualified professional" to demonstrate their application complies with applicable requirements. Such qualified professional could be, depending on the context, an architect, professional engineer, or professional geoscientist.

Professional reliance also applies to building design and construction, subdivision, infrastructure design and construction, wildfire or hazard development permits, riparian protection, flooding/landslide protection, geotechnical site issues, and more.

BRITISH COLUMBIA OFFICE
#1300, 128 PENDER STREET WEST
VANCOUVER, BC V6B 1R8
604.899.2269

ALBERTA OFFICE
#2200, 635 8TH AVENUE SW
CALGARY, AB T2P 3M3
587.852.4500

TOLL FREE 1.877.339.2199 - WWW.LIDSTONE.CA - FACSIMILE 604.899.2281

Colloquially, this practice is called “professional reliance”. Instead of a local government necessarily performing their own inspections or plan reviews for a given application, a local government is entitled to rely on the opinion of a qualified professional. Importantly, such professional reliance is not required - professional reliance as it exists under the current *Community Charter* and *Local Government Act* allows local governments to choose to use professionals as adjuncts to their own judgement in bylaw applications and permitting. This expedites development approvals and reinforces safety given the established expertise and track record of these professionals.

Importantly, most local governments with substantial flows of development applications have already established an advanced system of pre-certified qualified professionals and steps to expedite approvals.

In addition, the Bill would no longer allow a requirement for peer review of professionals’ errors or omissions.

2. The Act

Conversely, the *Professional Reliance Act* proposed under Bill M216–2025 **requires** local governments to accept as meeting permit or bylaw requirements, “any submission” certified by a professional under the *Professional Governance Act* (“PGA professional”). If there is a dispute between the PGA professional and the local government, the matter must be referred to the province for resolution. Note that ‘PGA professional’ is a far broader category than the *Community Charter*’s qualified professional and includes agrologists, science technologists, technicians, applied biologists, engineers, geoscientists, forest professionals, and architects. Planners are not included, and many classes of the proposed “PGA Professionals” under Bill M216 have no health and safety expertise regarding matters that would devolve to them under this Act.

Under the *Professional Reliance Act* the certification of these professionals overrides local government discretion in bylaws and permitting. If a PGA professional certifies a property and application as valid for a permit, the local government **must** accept that judgement (outside of the limited exceptions that a complaint has been made to the province/statutory body, which predictably will cause significant delays, or the application is “incomplete”, which will cause other delays). The existing expedited approval processes in communities, such as a 10-day Fast-Track program, could be impacted by Bill-generated delays where there are any number of site conditions requiring a professional that were previously addressed by professional reliance.

3. Impacts on Local Government

If Bill M216–2025 becomes law, local governments will no longer be able to rely on the historic body of “qualified professionals” or on the local government’s own discretion to review professional certified bylaw or permit applications for failure to adhere to local regulations. Also, if the local government’s opinion differs from that of the new PGA Professional or if it is apparent the PGA Professional is not

applying safety or other regulations, the local governments will be firewalled from due diligence. This applies to building design and construction, geotechnical site issues, subdivision, infrastructure design and construction, wildfire or hazard development permits, riparian protection, flooding/landslide protection, and more. As stated, the Bill would no longer allow a requirement for peer review.

The proposed *Professional Reliance Act* attempts to protect local governments from this new obligatory reliance on professionals by purporting to immunize local governments from "proceedings ... in respect of a submission certified by a PGA professional". Given the wording in the Bill compared to existing immunizing statutory language, and in the context of the case law, we think local governments will carry residual liability in spite of this attempt at statutory protection, and where the builder, owner, subcontractor, or PGA pro is dissolved or insolvent, the local government could be jointly and severally liable (except Vancouver under its separate liability protection). That means if a Village is found 5% liable, it pays 100% of the liability. No discussion of local government financial liability is as important, however, as the reduction of safety of people and the incidence of costly building failures that would be a predictable outcome of Bill M216.

In addition, it has been our experience that some of the sorts of PGA Pros listed in the Bill do not carry adequate insurance and it is always a struggle to get them to carry adequate insurance or agree to reasonable indemnification.

4. ACTION

Most new development in BC happens on floodplains, steep slopes, earthquake or tsunami zones, or wildfire interface regions, not to mention heavy rainfall and geotechnical hazard areas, so this legislation would concretely militate against the safety traditionally promoted by the building code, electrical and gas codes, hazardous site permits, development permit requirements, and other local government-administered protection of families, individuals, and buildings. This legislation could increase the costs and timelines for development approvals, result in potentially unprofessional "approvals" by consultants with no applicable expertise, increase risk for local governments and homeowners, and cause many local governments to abandon regulation altogether due to seriously increased risk and liability. In Atlin, BC, there is no local government and no enforced safety codes – maybe that is what the developer lobbyists are seeking here.

A building code amendment takes many years with wide consultation, so why would the government undermine decades of scientifically effective safety regs and their traditionally professional application?

The Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills will now consider the proposed legislation. Submissions to the committee can go to this link until December 2: https://consultation-portal.leg.bc.ca/consultations/154 .

From: CAO Sayward
To: CAO Sayward
Subject: Pushback grows against B.C. NDP"s stealthy housing deregulation manoeuvre
Date: November 27, 2025 6:31:39 PM

Pushback grows against B.C. NDP's stealthy housing deregulation manoeuvre

Douglas Todd: Questions are arising about why a radical piece of legislation that threatens construction standards wasn't introduced by the minister of housing. Instead, it was quietly sponsored by an NDP backbencher.

Author of the article:

By Douglas Todd

Published Nov 14, 2025



A wide range of critics charge that Bill M216, which aims to fast-track the entire province's building approval process, will not necessarily contribute to housing affordability. Photo by Arlen Redekop /PNG

Article content

Strong resistance is growing to a seemingly innocuous NDP private-member's bill that critics from across the political spectrum charge will dramatically undermine the power that B.C. mayors and councillors have to protect citizens from ill-suited buildings.

Questions are arising why such a radical piece of legislation, Bill M216, wasn't introduced by the minister of housing. Instead, it was brought in as a private member's

bill last month by a neophyte Vancouver Island MLA.

Bill M216, blandly titled the Professional Reliance Act, is scheduled to go to second reading on Monday.

“At its heart, this bill is about using every tool we have to make housing more attainable,” says the bill’s sponsor, backbench NDP MLA George Anderson (Nanaimo-Lantzville), a lawyer first elected last year, who was named parliamentary secretary for transit, an unrelated field.

A wide range of critics charge that Bill M216, which aims to fast-track the entire province’s building approval process, will not necessarily contribute to housing affordability. They maintain it will hand developers a way to weaken the professional standards designed to foster livable housing.

A coalition of 30 Metro Vancouver urbanists said, while the bill sounds bureaucratic and “harmless,” it would usher in a “significant shift” in which “developers would be able to bypass municipal oversight” by having projects approved by their hand-picked “certified agents” — without peer review by external professionals.

Both the B.C. Greens and the Conservatives are blasting the bill for handing further control to developers. Green MLA Jeremy Valeriote (West Vancouver-Sea to Sky) told the legislature that while most of the private professionals who would be hired by developers to review their projects would be “technically competent and have all the right intentions,” there “are a few bad actors out there, which is the reason for the need for regulation” and independent oversight.

The group of Metro urban planners, architects and scholars protested that “substantial policy legislation is rarely advanced this way. This approach raises serious questions about transparency and accountability, especially given the sweeping implications for local democracy.”

The coalition of urbanists maintain the bill — which they argue will hand unprecedented licence to developers to bypass impartial professional building reviews — is another way Premier David Eby’s government is “expanding provincial control over zoning and approvals, especially around transit corridors,” where the NDP is forcing cities to approve highrise clusters.

THE VILLAGE OF
NAKUSP

November 20, 2025

To my fellow small community colleagues,

It my pleasure to be reaching out to you from the UBCM Executive as your Small Community Representative.

We had our first executive meeting in Richmond last week, and I wanted to touch base with you for a few reasons:

- First of all, I would like all of you to know that I am here for you: if you would like to discuss what's going on in your community, if there is work that UBCM can assist you with, or if you just need someone to talk to about the challenges of local government. My cell phone number and email are below. Please feel free to reach out anytime.
- Second, I want to share what we your executive is doing; please see my notes below.
- Lastly, I would like to set up regular virtual check-ins for us small community folks throughout the year. If you would be interested in joining for an hour or so in the near future, *please RSVP to my email to say so and include a few topics of interest*, so I can facilitate a loose agenda.

Thank you for your support in taking on this important role at UBCM, and please know that I am here to support you in the important work you are doing in your own community.

Here is some of what we covered at the November UBCM Executive Meeting:

- analysis of our 2024 and 2025 resolutions from convention
- UBCM's response to the proposed changes to the Heritage Conservation Act: **https://conta.cc/4hWb0v3**
- received a delegation from Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs, Christine Boyle and Minister of State for Local Governments and Rural Communities, Brittny Anderson,
- endorsed the creation of a new committee to support local government engagement in the development of a comprehensive emergency management plan
- endorsed an extension of the end date of the Local Government Advisory Committee on Emergency and Disaster Management Act (EDMA) Regulations until June 30, 2026
- approved the Gitaanmax Band for membership, and
- arranged a workshop with legal counsel on the Cowichan Tribes Supreme Court decision at the February executive meeting.

  For more detailed information about UBCM's ongoing work, subscribe to The Compass, our periodical newsletter, here: **https://www.ubcm.ca/thecompass**

Aidan McLaren-Caux

UBCM Small Community Representative

Councillor
Village of Nakusp
PO Box 280, 91 1st Street NW, Nakusp, BC V0G 1R0
Phone: 250-265-3689. Cell: 250-265-8764 **Fax:** 250-265-3788
Email: amclarencaux@nakusp.com
Web: www.nakusp.com

From:	CAO Sayward
To:	CAO Sayward
Subject:	FW: MEDIA STATEMENT | Village of Sayward: Water Conservation & Landslide Update
Date:	November 27, 2025 10:31:34 AM

From: Elaine Popove <epopove@srd.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2025 1:49:39 p.m.
To:
Subject: MEDIA STATEMENT | Village of Sayward: Water Conservation & Landslide Update

MEDIA STATEMENT

November 25, 2025 Village of Sayward: Water Conservation & Landslide Update

The Village of Sayward, in partnership with the Strathcona Regional District (SRD), is providing an update on the current water conservation notice and turbidity issues in Newcastle Creek.

What Happened

On October 23, 2025, at around 9:15 pm, a landslide occurred in Newcastle Creek, roughly 1 km outside the Village. It was heard by residents in the Sayward Valley but did not impact public safety or private property.

Since then, Sayward Public Works has been closely monitoring the Water Treatment Plant (WTP), the Newcastle Creek water intake, and the water reservoir. Heavy rainfall and shifting fine materials continue to cause periodic turbidity, requiring precautionary temporary WTP shutdowns to prevent sediment from entering the WTP system.

Due to turbidity issues with the water drawn from Newcastle Creek and to better understand the landslide's extent and potential impacts on the drinking water source, the Village and SRD activated a Level 1 Emergency Operations Centre (EOC). With funding support from the Ministry of Emergency Management & Climate Readiness (EMCR), Campbell River Search and Rescue captured drone footage of the area on November 20, 2025:

- Bottom of slide (downstream): https://youtu.be/HWkDU5QOE-8
- Downstream toward slide then upslope: https://youtu.be/Lf3V6M73X2Q

Current Status

Despite periodic turbidity, the WTP, water intake, and reservoir are operating well, and impacts to residents remain minimal. Temporary shutdowns of the WTP may still be needed if turbidity rises, but staff will resume WTP operations as soon as conditions allow.

Next Steps

The EOC is now in discussion with McElhanney Ltd. and pursuing additional EMCR funding for a technical assessment of the landslide. This work will help identify remediation and mitigation options to protect Sayward's long-term drinking water supply.

Public Advisory

Residents are asked to:

- Avoid calling 911 for updates—keep emergency lines clear.
- Follow Alertable and official Village/SRD channels for current information.

The Village of Sayward and the SRD appreciate residents' patience and cooperation.

-##-

Media Contact:

Shaun Koopman, SRD Emergency Services Manager - 250-830-6702 | skoopman@srd.ca

(Currently unavailable; reachable starting Nov. 27)





REPORT TO COUNCIL

For: Mayor and Council
Prepared by: Lisa Clark, CFO
Subject: **Amendment to Bylaw 416, 2015 Council Procedure Bylaw**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

Section 124 of the *Community Charter* states that Council must, by bylaw, establish the general procedures to be followed by Council in conducting their business. The Village of Sayward has adopted Bylaw 416, Council Procedure Bylaw to comply with this requirement. The Council Procedure Bylaw is intended to ensure that the Village of Sayward conducts its business to meet the required principle and standard of open, accountable, and accessible government.

At the November 18, 2025, regular council meeting, Council directed staff to amend Bylaw 416 to amend the schedule for regular council meetings from the first and third Tuesday, to the second and fourth Tuesday of every month.

> **MOTION R25/287**
> **MOVED AND SECONDED**
> THAT Council adopts a Regular Meeting Schedule for 2026, following the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month.
> **Opposed Cllr Burchett, Cllr Poulsen** **CARRIED**

DISCUSSION

Once a local government has adopted a bylaw it can only be amended or repealed by bylaw. Staff have prepared DRAFT Bylaw No. 518, 2026 Council Procedure Amendment Bylaw for Council's consideration (attached).

Generally, bylaws to amend or repeal an existing bylaw are subject to the same approval and other requirements as the power to adopt a new bylaw under that authority, in accordance with legislation in the *Local Government Act and the Community Charter*.

Before adoption of an amendment bylaw to the Council Procedure Bylaw, Council must first give public notice in accordance with section 94 (public notice) of the *Community Charter* describing the proposed changes in general terms. Staff intend to advertise on the Village's public notice board, in the January 2026 Sayward News, on the Village website, and on the Village's Facebook page in advance of returning the bylaw to Council for further consideration and possible adoption.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THAT Council Procedure Amendment Bylaw No. 518, 2026 be given first, second, and third reading.
2. THAT Staff post notice of the proposed amendment on the Village's public notice board, in the January 2026 Sayward News, on the Village website, and on the Village's Facebook page; and,
3. THAT staff provide Council with a summary of any public comments received on the proposed amendment before final adoption.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Clark, CPA, CGA
Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Council package

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments:

- ***DRAFT Bylaw No. 518, 2026 – Council Procedure Bylaw Amendment***
- ***Public Notice***

VILLAGE OF SAYWARD

BYLAW NO. 518

A BYLAW TO AMEND COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW 416, 2015

WHEREAS the Council of the Village of Sayward has adopted a Council Procedure Bylaw;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Village of Sayward wishes to amend "Council Procedure Bylaw No. 416, 2015" (as amended);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Municipal Council of the Village of Sayward, in open meeting assembled, hereby enacts as follows:

1. CITATION

This bylaw may be cited as **"Council Procedure Amendment Bylaw No. 518, 2026"**.

2. AMENDEMENT

Council Procedure Bylaw No. 416, 2015 is hereby amended as follows:

a.) THAT Part 2, section 5, Time and location of meetings, be amended by deleting (2) in its entirety and replacing with the following:

(2) Regular Council meetings must:

(a) be held on a schedule that generally follows the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, and

(b) begin at 7:00 pm;

(c) be adjourned at 11:00 pm on the day scheduled for the meeting unless Council resolves to proceed beyond that time in accordance with section 30;

(d) when such a meeting falls on a statutory holiday, be held on the next Tuesday or a time determined by Council.

Read a first time on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

Read a second time on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

Read a third time on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

Adopted on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

DRAFT

Certified a true copy of Bylaw No. 518
this ___ day of _____, _____

Chief Administrative Officer
Village of Sayward

Mayor

Corporate Officer

DRAFT

Village of Sayward

PUBLIC NOTICE

NOTICE TO AMEND COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW NO. 416, 2015

Notice is hereby given that the Council for the Village of Sayward is proposing to amend its current *Procedures Bylaw,* known as COUNCIL PROCEDURE BYLAW NO. 416, 2015. This notice is provided in accordance with the requirement in Sections 94 and 124 of the *Community Charter*.

The Procedure Bylaw establishes the rules and regulations under which all proceedings of Council and its committees and other bodies established by Council are to be governed and how meetings are to be conducted.

Generally, the purpose of the amendment is to update meeting procedures as follows:

- Amend the schedule for regular council meetings from the first and third Tuesday, to the second and fourth Tuesday of every month.

Council will consider adoption of the amendment to Council Procedure Bylaw 416, 2015 at its meeting scheduled for Tuesday January 13, 2026, at 7:00 pm.

A copy of both the amending bylaw (Bylaw No. 518) and Council Procedure Bylaw 416, 2015 is available at the Village of Sayward office, 652 H'Kusam Way, Sayward, BC from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm Monday to Friday. Copies will also be posted to the Village website. Persons who wish to comment on the proposed changes may submit comments in writing to the Chief Administrative Officer, 652 H'Kusam Way, Sayward, BC, V0P 1R0, or to cao@saywardvalley.ca before noon on Tuesday, January 13, 2026.

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer &
Corporate Officer
Village of Sayward

REPORT TO COUNCIL

To: Mayor and Council
From: Lisa Clark, CFO
Subject: **Sayward Royal Canadian Legion Service Agreement - Share Shed**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

The Share Shed building, located in the Kelsey Centre parking lot, is owned by the Village of Sayward (the Village). Historically the facility has served as a community resource for the exchange of gently used household items. The Share Shed is currently operated by volunteers from the Sayward Royal Canadian Legion Branch 147 (the Legion). Multiple Council resolutions have affirmed the relationship between the Village and the Legion, and several Service Agreements have been executed over the last few years.

DISCUSSION

The partnership between the Village and the Legion continues to provide a valuable service to the community and is considered mutually beneficial. Revenues generated at the Share Shed are distributed on an 80/20 basis: 80% of proceeds are allocated to the Legion, and 20% to the Village, which are used to offset costs associated with renovations, utilities, garbage disposal, recycling fees, and ongoing maintenance of the Share Shed.

Revenues for the last 3 fiscal periods are listed in the table below.

Table A:

Share Shed Revenues	2023	2024	2025 YTD
Legion portion 80%	$ 3,122.16	$ 3,667.32	$ 4,421.60
Village portion 20%	$ 780.54	$ 916.83	$ 1,105.40
Total	**$ 3,902.70**	**$ 4,584.15**	**$ 5,527.00**

The most recent Service Agreement between the Village and the Legion expired on March 31, 2025.

The Legion has expressed interest in renewing the Service Agreement and Staff have prepared a draft agreement for Council's consideration. To reduce administrative burden, a two-year term is recommended. Staff further recommend aligning the term with the calendar year; therefore, the proposed agreement would be effective from January 1, 2026, to December 31, 2027.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **THAT Council** approves the renewal of the Share Shed Service Agreement between the Village of Sayward and the Sayward Royal Canadian Legion for two (2) years starting January 1, 2026; and
2. **THAT Council** authorizes the Mayor and Corporate Officer to execute the Share Shed Service Agreement on behalf of the Village.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Clark, CPA, CGA
Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Council package

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment:

- ***DRAFT Share Shed Service Agreement***

SERVICE AGREEMENT
FOR THE OPERATION OF THE SHARE SHED
("AGREEMENT")

BETWEEN:
Village of Sayward ("Village")
652 H'Kusam Way
Sayward, BC
V0P 1R0

AND:
Sayward Royal Canadian Legion ("Legion")
Branch 147
699 Sayward Road
Sayward, BC
V0P 1R0

WHEREAS the Village owns the building known as the Share Shed ("Shed") located at 652 H'Kusam Way;

WHEREAS the Legion wishes to occupy and use the Shed for the purpose of receiving and offering used items donated by the public to the community;

NOW THEREFORE in consideration of the terms and conditions set forth below, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. DEFINITIONS

In this Agreement:

"CAO" means the Chief Administrative Officer for the Village of Sayward.

"Utilities" means the required power or service sources (electricity, telephone, internet, or other) that may be supplied by the Village to the Share Shed building.

1) LEGION RESPONSIBILITIES

1.1 The Legion will:

a) Provide workers for the Shed to maintain operations at least three (3) days per week, with hours of operation not less than three (3) hours per day. Any changes to the schedule must be communicated to the CAO.
b) Maintain the Shed in a clean condition and ensure that items not suitable for re-sale are efficiently recycled or disposed of in a timely manner.
c) Adhere to all safety protocols, including keeping exits clear, and ensuring all workers are knowledgeable about their roles and safety procedures.
d) Advise the Village immediately of any safety concerns or hazards that need to be addressed for the safe operation of the Shed.
e) Post operating hours on the entrance door for public viewing.
f) Secure the Shed during non-operational hours.

DRAFT

g) Take all reasonable measures to ensure accurate accounting of funds and provide an annual written report to the CAO outlining proceeds, submission of any funds under Section 3 of this Agreement, and any concerns, recommendations, or opportunities. Ideally, the report should also include measures for waste diversion from the landfill. The CAO will prepare a staff report annually for Mayor and Council summarizing the data provided by the Legion. This report should be prepared and presented to Council before the end of every fiscal year.
h) Ensure all workers and members of the public comply with ***Policy 200-03 Respectful Workplace Policy***, as the Shed is located on Village property.

2) VILLAGE RESPONSIBILITES

2.1 The Village will:

a) Fund the utilities and ongoing maintenance of the Shed and provide the Legion with at least four (4) business days advance notice when general work is required at the Shed.
b) Advertise the hours of the Shed in the Village monthly newsletter and through social media at its own cost.

3) DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE

a) All revenues generated from the operation of the Shed will be divided as follows: 80% to the Legion, to be allocated at their own discretion, and 20% to the Village for cost recovery related to renovations, utilities, garbage, recycling fees, and ongoing maintenance.

4) TERM

a) The term of this Agreement shall be two (2) years, commencing **January 1, 2026, and expiring December 31, 2027**.
b) The Legion must contact the Village by October 1, 2026, if it wishes to renew the Agreement. The Village will offer the Legion the first right of refusal, provided neither party has exercised its rights under Section 4) c. of this Agreement and all terms have been satisfied.
c) Either party may terminate this Agreement by providing the other party with written notice of not less than two (2) months. In the event of a major breach or safety concern, the Village may provide immediate notice and reserves the right to suspend operations until conditions are deemed safe.
d) If the Agreement ends and is not renewed, the Legion agrees to vacate the Shed, removing all items and leaving the premises clean and in the same condition found when first occupied.

The Parties have executed this Agreement by their duly authorized representatives as follows:

Village of Sayward	**Royal Canadian Legion**
_____	_____
Name: **Mark Baker**	Name:
Title: **Mayor**	Title:
Signed this ___ day of _____, 20___	Signed this ___ day of _____, 20___

DRAFT

REPORT TO COUNCIL

For: Mayor and Council
Prepared by: Jennifer Redshaw, Office Administrator
Subject: **Sayward News Re-Imagined**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

The *Sayward News* monthly newsletter has been in circulation in Sayward since at least 1975. Originally called the Sayward News Bulletin, the publication was initially two black-and-white pages with content compiled and printed by volunteers. Today, the *Sayward News* is an 8-12 page full-colour monthly newsletter booklet mailed to approximately 120 households in the Village of Sayward and 265 Sayward Valley households in the Strathcona Regional District (SRD). The *Sayward News* is also posted on the Village website, and archived copies are available dating back to 2018.

The *Sayward News* content currently consists of the following categories:

a) Contact Information
- Emails & phone numbers for elected officials of the Village of Sayward, SRD, Campbell River School District 72, Provincial Government Member of Legislative Assembly, and Federal Government Member of Parliament
- Emails & phone numbers for local Emergency Services
- Emails & phone numbers for local community organizations

b) Municipal, Health & Regional Services Information
- Annual schedule of Regular Council Meeting dates for the Village of Sayward and the SRD
- Village of Sayward general information and reminders regarding bylaw compliance, property taxes etc.
- Comox Strathcona Waste Management Information
- Articles provided by SRD Area A Director, Village of Sayward Mayor, Village of Sayward Councillors
- Monthly schedule of the Sayward Health Clinic
- Articles provided by Sayward Health Clinic

- Articles provided by Sayward's BC Emergency Health Services Community Paramedic

c) Community Information
   - Monthly schedule of Kelsey Recreation Centre programming and special event promotion (when the Centre had dedicated staff and programming)
   - Articles provided by Sayward Garden Club
   - Notices of various community events and community organization activities regarding Heritage Hall, Seniors Lunches, Sayward Literacy Now, Sayward School, Sayward Royal Canadian Legion #147 etc.

d) Paid Advertising
   - Business Directory – located on the back of the *Sayward News*
   - ¼ page to full-page advertisements

DISCUSSION

Due to expected financial constraints for the Village in 2026, several municipal services are being analyzed and evaluated to determine viability. As part of this process, the monthly *Sayward News* has been identified as a service requiring streamlined processes, elimination of redundancies, and cost saving measures.

Information contained in the *Sayward News* is accessible to the public though multiple channels, including various websites and Facebook pages – most notably the Village of Sayward's website. The Village of Sayward's website contains a Business Directory page with local organizations, local businesses, and Village of Sayward business licence holders' contact information and organization details.

Advertising content in the *Sayward News* is guided by **Bylaw No. 451 Village of Sayward Fees and Charges Bylaw, 2019**, **Schedule B - Sayward News** which is attached to this report. Non-profit groups receive free advertising for a ¼ page, and certain community groups have been granted additional space for no charge, such as the Sayward Health Clinic, Sayward Volunteer Fire Department, and BC Emergency Health Services.

Paid advertising accounts for 30-40% of the pages in the newsletter each month.

The *Sayward News* is printed in-house on 11x17 paper in full colour. Printing takes approximately five hours to complete. Once printed, several local volunteers donate their time to fold approximately 385 copies into booklets. Once folded, the newsletters are delivered to the post office and mailed to Village and Valley households that allow delivery of neighbourhood mail (flyers).

Staff looked at several small BC municipalities with populations under 600 and small staffing levels similar to the Village of Sayward. The table below compares 12 small BC municipalities, including the Village of Sayward, regarding local government produced newsletters.

Table # 1:

Muncipality	Newsletter ?	Paid Advertising?	Printed In-House?	Mailed as Flyer?	Frequency	Format	Additional Information
Village of Silverton	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of New Denver	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of Hazleton	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of Port Clemens	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of Clinton	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of Tahsis	no	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Village of Granisle	yes	no	yes	yes	monthly	1-2 double-sided 8.5x 11	No community events/information. Council business updates only
Village of Zeballos	yes	no	yes	yes	monthly	3-5 double-sided 8.5x 11	
Village of McBride	yes	no	yes	no	monthly	1 double-sided 8.5x 11	Insert placed in independant local paper & available only at local businesses
Village of Lytton	yes	no	yes	no	bi-weekly	5-6 double-sided 8.5x11	Printed copies available in office only. Produced by a Communications Contractor funded through special emergency rebuilding grants. Funding ending soon.
Village of Slocan	yes	no	yes	yes	monthly	1 double-sided 11x17	
Village of Sayward	**yes**	**yes**	**yes**	**yes**	**monthly**	**4-6 double-sided 11x17**	

As outlined in Table #1 above, Sayward is unique in the size and content of its printed newsletter.

The municipalities that do not generate a compiled newsletter do provide Municipal, Health & Regional Services Information and Community Information as individual postings in the News section of their websites.

Financial Information

The production costs of the *Sayward News* for 2025 are outlined below in Table #2.a below. Costs are split between the Village of Sayward and the Strathcona Regional District (SRD) based on the number of neighborhood mail (flyer) recipients (See Table #2.a).

Table # 2.a:

2025 Annual Cost to Produce Sayward News	
Paper	$ 1,434.42
Toner	$ 4,368.74
Postage	$ 671.91
Total Printed Copy Cost	**$ 6,475.07**
Staff Time: Advertising	$ 1,100.00
Staff Time: Compiling	$ 3,039.52
Total Staff Time Cost	**$ 4,139.52**
Grand Total Costs	**$ 10,614.59**
Advertising Revenue	-$ 1,954.56
Net Total Cost	**$ 8,660.03**
Village of Sayward's Share **31%**	$ 2,684.61
SRD Share **69%**	$ 5,975.42
	$ 8,660.03

Table # 2.b

Total Printed Copy Cost	**$ 6,475.07**
Village of Sayward's Share **31%**	$ 2,007.27
SRD Share **69%**	$ 4,467.80
	$ 6,475.07

The total annual cost of printing and postage for the *Sayward News* for 2025 is $6,475.07 (see Table #2.a). Since paid advertising accounts for an average of **35%** of the newsletter's content, the associated printing and postage expenses are **$2,266.27**. In addition, managing paid advertisements required an estimated minimum of 25 staff hours in 2025, representing approximately **$1,100.00** in staffing costs annually. Table #3 below summarizes the net costs of providing paid advertising in 2025.

Table # 3:

Paid Advertising - Print & Postage Cost (35% of $6475.07)	$	2,266.27
Paid Advertising - Staff Time	$	1,100.00
Total Paid Advertising Revenue	-$	1,954.56
Net Paid Advertising Costs	**$**	**1,411.71**

Analyzing this information shows that the costs to provide paid advertising exceed the revenues generated by $1,411.71. Additionally, the time spent by staff on managing paid advertisements (soliciting, invoicing and processing payments) increases in the months of December, January and February due to renewals of the annual Business Directory advertising. This places an additional burden on staff who are focusing on year-end financial reconciliations and reporting at the same time.

Sayward News Re-Imagined

Two key opportunities have been identified within the *Sayward News* that could help streamline operations, reduce costs, and free up staff capacity to focus on higher priority initiatives:

1. Adjust Content:
    - **Remove the Front Page.** This space is dominated with colour graphics and offers limited content value. The *Sayward News* title would remain prominently at the start of the newsletter.
    - **Remove the Contact Information Pages**. This information is readily available on the Village of Sayward's website and other online sources.
    - **Discontinue Paid Advertising.** Local Businesses and Organizations can be listed on the Village of Sayward's website free of charge. Businesses, Organizations, and Individuals can use their saved *Sayward News* advertising fees to mail flyers themselves or utilize other advertising avenues like the Go Sayward website or the Around Sayward Facebook page.

2. Adjust Distribution
    - **Discontinue Printing and Mailing**. Cost savings for discontinuing the printing and mailing of the *Sayward News* equals $2,007.27 for the Village of Sayward and $4,467.80 for the SRD which can be seen in Table # 2.b above. Residents who would like a printed version of the *Sayward News*

can visit the municipal office during business hours where a copy can be printed in-house (black & white or colour) for a fee according to **Bylaw No. 451 Village of Sayward Fees and Charges Bylaw, 2019**, **Schedule A - General Administration** (attached to this report).

Staff consulted with Strathcona Regional District Area A Director, Gerald Whalley, who concurred that discontinuing printing and mailing the *Sayward News* would generate substantial cost savings. Following a telephone conversation, Mr. Whalley provided written confirmation via email, a copy of which is attached to this report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the overview provided in this report, staff recommend **THAT Council:**

1. Approves the proposed adjustments to the content and distribution of the *Sayward News* as described in this report to Council.

OR

2. {Alternatively Council could direct staff to take another action deemed appropriate by Council.}

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer Redshaw, Office Administrator

Approved for Council package

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments:

1. **Bylaw No. 451, Village of Sayward Fees & Charges Bylaw, 2019: Schedule A – General Administration**
2. **Bylaw No. 451, Village of Sayward Fees & Charges Bylaw, 2019: Schedule B – Sayward News**
3. **Email correspondence from Gerald Whalley - SRD Area A Director**

SCHEDULE A

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

DESCRIPTION	FEE
Cheque returned as Not-Sufficient Funds	$50.00
Property tax certificate	$30.00
Photocopies – Colour	$1.50/page
Photocopies – Black and White	$0.50/page
Faxes	$2.00 first page $0.75 each additional page
Scan and email	$0.50/page
Processing fee to issue refunds on accounts	$25.00
Cost to reissue a lost cheque (except those lost in the mail)	Stop payment fee plus $15.00
Deposit for keys and fobs	$25.00

SCHEDULE B

SAYWARD NEWS *

DESCRIPTION	FEE
Copy Ready Ads and Articles per Issue	
Full page	$65.00
½ page	$45.00
¼ page	$30.00
1/8 page	$20.00
Business card (3.75" x 2.5")	$12.50
Ads and Articles placed in multiple issues	
2x – 10% discount on total	
3x to 5x – 20% discount on total	
More than 5x – 30% discount	
**Set-up Charges (if applicable) ** **	
Full page	$60.00
½ page and ¼ page	$45.00
1/8 page and business card	$35.00
Business Directory	
Business listing which includes name, logo, contact information and a brief description of business. Published 12 times a year plus feature business ad once a year (1/4 page)	$90.00/year
Classified Ads	
25 words or less	$15.00
Additional words	$0.25/each
Community/Family announcements, Memorials, Thank You's or non-Profit Groups	
1. Individual – 1/8 page free	N/A
2. Non-profit – ¼ page free	N/A
* Content must conform to Newsletter Policy	
* Rates include GST	
** Set-up charges include any non-copy ready work the Village is asked to create or modify to fit the newsletter. Content/Formatting requests that require third-party expertise subject to additional charges.	

From: Gerald Whalley <gwhalley@srd.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2025 11:55 AM
To: CFO <cfo@saywardvalley.ca>
Subject: RE: Sayward News - possible new model

Good morning, Lisa,

Thank you for advising me of this potential change to the monthly Sayward News production. I am very much in favour of discontinuing the printing and mailing of the Sayward News. This will reduce costs both to Area 'A' and the Village. Almost everyone will have access to this publication through the Village's website. As a suggestion, perhaps the Village might consider developing a list of email addresses of those who would request the publication be sent automatically to their inbox, or as an alternative, the publication could also be posted on the "Around Sayward" web page.

Thank you,

Gerald Whalley

Regional Director
Strathcona Regional District
Kyuquot-Nootka/Sayward (Area 'A')

(250) 282-3787
gwhalley@srd.ca

From: CFO <cfo@saywardvalley.ca>
Sent: November 25, 2025 11:04 AM
To: Gerald Whalley <gwhalley@srd.ca>
Cc: Sayward Finance-Admin <village@saywardvalley.ca>
Subject: Sayward News - possible new model

NOTICE: This email is from an external source.

Good morning Gerald,

As discussed, the Village of Sayward is looking for ways to streamline processes and reduce costs. One of the services being looked at is the monthly Sayward News production. Staff will be presenting some options for Council at the December 2, 2025, regular council meeting, with one of the options being the discontinuation of the printing and mailing of the Sayward News. The Sayward News would still be available electronically on the Village website, and residents would be able to request a printed copy at the Village office for a small printing fee, in accordance with the Village of Sayward Fees & Charges Bylaw.

Considering this is a shared Village and Ara A service, the Village would appreciate your input as to whether you would agree to this potential change.

Thanking you in advance for your response,
Lisa

Lisa Clark, CPA, CGA
Chief Financial Officer
Village of Sayward
652 H'Kusam Way, PO Box 29
Sayward, BC V0P 1R0
250-282-5512 Ext. 3 (office)

Village of Sayward

The Village of Sayward respectfully acknowledges that the land we gather on is on the unceded territory of the K'ómoks First Nation, the traditional keepers of this land.

REPORT TO COUNCIL

To: Mayor and Council
From: Lisa Clark, CFO
Subject: **Financial Plan 2026-2030**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

The five-year Financial Plan (FP) is developed by Council through their strategic planning process and the Council approved Strategic Plan (SP). This document identifies for staff, and the public, what types and quality of services are to be provided by the Village for a 5 year period. The FP also outlines upcoming projects and capital expenditures, and the related sources of funding including grant revenues and reserve transfers.

DISCUSSION

The FP bylaw and related Tax Rate bylaw must be approved by Council before **May 15** (firm deadline) of each year as set out in the *Community Charter*.

Staff plan on meeting with department managers and staff in December 2025 and January 2026 to analyze 2025 expenditures to date, and to draft base budgets for various departments for 2026.

In order to potentially implement items from the SP into the 2026 budget, Council may wish to review the current SP at the first scheduled financial planning session. These sessions will allow for Council and public participation and provide an opportunity for dialogue in shaping the 2026 budget. Meetings will be held as Committee of the Whole meetings, and it is recommended that at least 3 meetings be scheduled.

Staff are recommending the following dates for Committee of the Whole (COW) FP meetings:

Tuesday, February 3, 2026

Tuesday, February 17, 2026

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

The proposed timetable for working towards adoption of the 2026-2030 FP follows:

	Item	Notes	Timeline
1	Staff review of 2025-2029 FP and existing SP	Staff Report with timetable for 2026-2030 financial planning sessions to Council	December 2, 2025, regular council meeting
2	Staff work on base FP and Capital Plan for 2026-2030 with department manager and staff input		December 2025 and January 2026

3	FP Process: A. COW Council Meeting February 3, 2026. Council review of SP. Detailed review of FP/Capital Projects B. COW Council Meeting February 17, 2026. Detailed review of FP/Capital Projects C. COW Council Meeting March 3, 2026. Final review of FP/Capital Projects D. Regular Council Meeting March 10, 2026. Approval of FP E. Regular Council Meeting March 24, 2026 – First 3 readings of FP Bylaw F. Council Meeting April 14, 2026. Final reading of the FP Bylaw	Each meeting will refine the Financial and Capital Plans and provide time for Council review, public input, and questions. The timeline will also allow for research and reporting back to Council on identified issues. Adopt Financial and Capital Plan	February 3, 2026 February 17, 2026 March 3, 2026 March 10, 2026 March 24, 2026 April 14, 2026
4	Tax Rate Bylaw, Fees & Charges Amendment Bylaw (for water, sewer, solid waste user fees)		Adopted by mid May, first 3 readings April 14, 2026, Final reading April 28, 2026.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Bearing in mind that the schedule described above may need to change in response to unknown factors, it is recommended that Council members add these dates to their calendars at this time. Accordingly, it is recommended …

> ***THAT Council*** *schedule the following dates for Committee of the Whole meetings for Financial Planning purposes:*
>
> ***Tuesday, February 3, 2026, at 6 pm***
>
> ***Tuesday, February 17, 2026, at 6 pm***
>
> ***Tuesday, March 3, 2026, at 6 pm***

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Clark, CPA, CGA
Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Council package

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

REPORT TO COUNCIL

To: Mayor and Council
From: Lisa Clark, CFO
Subject: **Financial Projection to December 31, 2025**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

As part of the financial work under Council's approved five-year financial plan, staff have analyzed the Village's financial needs through December 31, 2025, and have prepared a ***projection*** that includes the organization's upcoming operating costs for the remainder of the year. A financial projection is a forecast of future financial performance, including estimated income, expenses, and cash flow, based on historical data and market assumptions. It is a "best guess" and is one of the tools used by staff to predict future operational costs.

DISCUSSION

Considering there are 2 months left in the fiscal year, and essential daily operating costs will continue (wages, utilities, IT, contract labour, and legal for example) staff have used historical data to formulate a ***projection*** of operational costs to December 31, 2025.

Additionally, critical items that were not part of the original financial plan that are necessary for water and sewer infrastructure maintenance and repairs, or items required by the Province under infrastructure permits, have also been included in the ***projection***. These infrastructure items are non-negotiable and must be completed before the end of the fiscal year:

Table A:

Item	**Cost**
Campground lift station – emergency repairs	$7,500
Wastewater lagoon – emergency repairs	$550
Wastewater lagoon – permit requirements (lagoon flow meter and datalogger)	$17,325
Wastewater lagoon – surge protection	$2,300
Water treatment plant – permit requirement (chlorine analyzer)	$14,000
Total	**$41,675**

Budgeted reserve transfers for both water and sewer ($30,000 each, $60,000 total) have also been included in the ***projection*** as these transfers are part of the original financial plan approved by Council.

Due to uncertainty around some costs, such as legal and consulting, staff have included ***projection*** estimates based on historical expenditures for the first 10 months of 2025. This means that the projected expenditures for these line items may be overstated in the ***projection***, but it allows Council to see the effect of these operational costs if they continue with the current trend.

Staff will not have a complete picture of final expenditures until around the 3rd week of January 2026, when all costs for the 2025 fiscal year have been accounted for as part of the year-end procedures. Up to date information will be provided to Council during budget discussions, which typically occur in January and February of each year.

The Village's ***projected*** operational revenues and expenses through to December 31, 2025 are summarized below in Table B:

Table B:

Summary	2024 Budget	2024 Actual to Dec 31, 2024	% of Budget	2025 Budget	Projection to Dec 31, 2025	% of Budget
OPERATING REVENUE						
Taxation - General Municipal Purpose	**456,492**	**458,159**	**100.4%**	**625,395**	**627,642**	**100.4%**
Other Taxes	**15,008**	**13,554**	**90.3%**	**14,349**	**14,312**	**99.7%**
Federal Community Works Fund Grant	**75,149**	**78,620**	**104.6%**	**78,620**	**78,620**	**100.0%**
Provincial Gov't Grant - Small Community	**384,000**	**368,200**	**95.9%**	**368,500**	**335,000**	**90.9%**
LGCAP Grant	**120,373**	**120,373**	**100.0%**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Interest & Tax Penalties	**13,275**	**11,778**	**88.7%**	**11,300**	**9,012**	**79.8%**
General Investment Income	**74,622**	**93,286**	**125.0%**	**85,750**	**49,539**	**57.8%**
Other Revenue	**48,850**	**86,895**	**177.9%**	**5,450**	**5,455**	**100.1%**
Licences, Permits & Fines	**12,100**	**4,755**	**39.3%**	**13,310**	**5,642**	**42.4%**
General Operating Grants	**259,980**	**106,681**	**41.0%**	**171,500**	**60,555**	**35.3%**
Sale of Service - Recreation Centre	**25,216**	**33,435**	**132.6%**	**22,528**	**9,773**	**43.4%**
Donations - Recreation Centre	**7,790**	**10,984**	**141.0%**	**13,950**	**3,874**	**27.8%**
Sale of Service - Other	**29,805**	**41,602**	**139.6%**	**37,407**	**24,950**	**66.7%**
Fire Rescue Revenue	**5,000**	**10,818**	**216.4%**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
RCMP Rent	**24,000**	**24,000**	**100.0%**	**25,000**	**25,000**	**100.0%**
RCMP Maintenance	**9,748**	**8,115**	**83.2%**	**9,748**	**6,785**	**69.6%**
Sewer Revenue	**98,561**	**104,459**	**106.0%**	**110,539**	**112,862**	**102.1%**
Water Revenue	**163,565**	**168,118**	**102.8%**	**201,151**	**177,633**	**88.3%**
Solid Waste Revenue	**52,654**	**55,682**	**105.8%**	**55,882**	**58,494**	**104.7%**
Total Operating Revenue	**1,876,188**	**1,799,513**	**95.9%**	**1,850,379**	**1,605,148**	**86.7%**
OPERATING EXPENDITURES						
Legislative Services	78,455	67,506	**86.0%**	57,400	57,216	**99.7%**
Administration	721,754	701,461	**97.2%**	659,540	906,851	**137.5%**
Election	13,363	6,157	**46.1%**	0	0	**0.0%**
Recreation Centre	300,388	318,242	**105.9%**	231,102	128,617	**55.7%**
Parks	39,410	27,379	**69.5%**	43,216	30,076	**69.6%**
Public Works	103,650	106,998	**103.2%**	107,791	90,976	**84.4%**
Roads	54,264	36,300	**66.9%**	47,620	35,533	**74.6%**
Drainage	14,325	9,543	**66.6%**	15,461	15,570	**100.7%**
Planning	23,479	38,500	**164.0%**	32,950	43,900	**133.2%**
Police	11,186	8,115	**72.5%**	10,492	6,785	**64.7%**
Fire	58,329	42,014	**72.0%**	44,000	3,807	**8.7%**
Emergency	9,123	1,573	**17.2%**	9,218	1,286	**14.0%**
Health Clinic	1,000	571	**57.1%**	1,000	350	**35.0%**
Solid Waste	48,500	50,621	**104.4%**	52,100	47,810	**91.8%**
Sewer Operations	102,052	74,591	**73.1%**	109,118	105,297	**96.5%**
Water Operations	190,928	184,606	**96.7%**	199,851	223,373	**111.8%**
Total Departmental Expenditures	**1,770,206**	**1,674,178**	**94.6%**	**1,620,859**	**1,697,447**	**104.7%**
Surplus/(Deficit) Before Amortization and transfers to Reserves	**105,982**	**125,336**		**229,520**	**(92,299)**	
Reserve transfers	120,205	202,356		141,983	141,983	
Surplus/(Deficit)	**(14,223)**	**(77,020)**		**87,537**	**(234,282)**	

As can be seen in the ***projection*** data provided above in Table B, without changes to the current financial plan, a deficit of approximately **$234,000** is expected for the 2025 fiscal year.

OPTIONS

Several options are available to Council to address the ***projected*** deficit. Staff have consulted with the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs, and offer the following possibilities for Council consideration:

1.) Deferment of transfers to reserves

The original financial plan included the following reserve transfers (Table C) which could be deferred to 2026 or cancelled. Staff recommend that these transfers be deferred to 2026. A Council resolution will be necessary to defer these transfers, and the financial plan will need to be amended.

Table C:

Item	**Amount**
Transfer to water capital reserve	$30,000
Transfer to sewer capital reserve	$30,000
Total	**$60,000**

2.) Growing Communities Fund (GCF) Reserve

The GCF monies received by the Province in 2023 are eligible to be used on community infrastructure and amenity demands, typically large capital projects that address drinking water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, storm water management, road improvements and other capital projects. Operating costs included in the financial plan such as wages, utilities, small equipment purchases, general repair and maintenance costs, and consumable supplies are not eligible uses of this funding.

However, after speaking with Ministry staff, it has been determined that small equipment costs – even though not considered assets according to the Village of Sayward's *Tangible Capital Asset Policy* – are considered physical assets, and staff have confirmed with the Ministry that GCF monies can be used to fund these costs, on an exception basis.

Several equipment purchases have already taken place in 2025, and some are in progress (as listed above in Table A). While the exact total is not yet known, an ***estimate*** of total equipment costs in 2025 is around the $65,000 – $80,000 range.

There is approximately $314,000 available in the GCF reserve and staff recommend that a transfer from the GCF reserve be approved. A resolution from Council will be necessary to transfer any GCF reserve funds.

3.) Unappropriated surplus

Surplus balances at the beginning of 2025 are listed in the table below:

Table D:

Surplus (Unappropriated)	General	Sewer	Water	Total
Opening Balance Jan 1, 2025	**(58,745)**	**132,207**	**102,863**	176,325

Any remaining deficit can be addressed by drawing funds from unappropriated surplus during the year-end reconciliation and financial statement preparation process. Subject to Council's approval, monies from these unappropriated surpluses could be utilized. Staff will have a more accurate picture of what the remaining deficit will be in early 2026.

4.) Cash flow for the remainder of 2025 and into 2026

Considering annual tax revenues are not collected until July of every year, Staff anticipate cash flow will be an issue starting in early 2026. To mitigate any cash shortages and to ensure bills are paid, the Village may pass a revenue anticipation bylaw which will allow the Village to obtain short term financing in the way of a line of credit. Subject to Council's approval, staff recommend that Council approve a revenue anticipation bylaw.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1.) THAT Council approve the following amendments to the 2025-2029 Financial Plan:

a.) Deferment of the 2025 capital reserve transfers for water and sewer.

b.) A transfer of up to $80,000 from the Growing Communities Fund Reserve for equipment purchases in 2025.

c.) The use of unappropriated surplus for any remaining deficit in 2025.

2.) THAT Council direct staff to prepare a Revenue Anticipation Bylaw for 2026 for Council consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Clark, CPA
Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Council package

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

REPORT TO COUNCIL

To: Mayor and Council
From: Lisa Clark, CFO
Subject: **Revenue Anticipation Bylaw No. 517, 2026**
Meeting date: December 2, 2025

BACKGROUND

Section 177 of the *Community Charter* grants municipalities the authority to borrow money for a short term in anticipation of the receipt of funding such as grant payments from other levels of government, or to fund operating expenditures before annual property tax revenues are collected. A Council approved revenue anticipation borrowing bylaw is used to provide authorization for staff to access this short-term borrowing, in the form of a line of credit.

DISCUSSION

Monthly cash flow demands for the Village are relatively consistent; however, revenue streams are not. The bulk of municipal cash inflows occur in June and July when annual property tax revenues are collected and the Provincial Small Communities Grant (approximately $340k) is received. On average, the Village's monthly net cash flow to cover operating expenses is approximately $100,000 - $110,000, excluding budgeted capital projects.

In 2026 the Village is forecasting significant capital expenditures towards the MacMillan Drainage Project and may face cash flow shortfalls due to the turnaround time between cash being outlaid and reimbursed by the Province (30-60 days). The total amount approved under the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP) grant is $1,278,197 and to date, a total of $91,189 in expenses have been submitted and reimbursed by the Province. This leaves a total of $1,187,008 of the ICIP grant outstanding.

Any borrowing under this bylaw will only be used to fund expenditures under the 2026-2030 financial plan and only as a last resort to fund unforeseen cash flow constraints should any arise. The total authorized amount is 75% of the 2025 total tax levy plus outstanding amounts from other governments, which is $890,000. Any funds received from either the Federal or Provincial government, or from property taxation, must be used to repay amounts borrowed under this bylaw, with the line of credit repayable in full by the end of 2026.

If unused, the line of credit will not incur costs for the Village. Staff will prepare a report for Council if funds are used, outlining the amounts and interest charged. The borrowing costs would be at a variable interest rate, which at the time of writing this report is 2.94%.

NEXT STEPS

If Council gives the proposed bylaw the first three readings at this meeting, the bylaw will return for further Council consideration and potentially adoption at a regular council meeting in January 2026. From there, if adopted, Staff will proceed with setting up the line of credit with the Municipal Finance Authority.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **THAT Council** gives first, second, and third reading to Revenue Anticipation Bylaw No. 517, 2026; and
2. **THAT Council** authorizes the Mayor and Chief Financial Officer to sign the necessary forms to procure short-term financing from the Municipal Finance Authority.

Respectfully submitted,



Approved for Council package

_____ _____

Lisa Clark, CPA, CGA
Chief Financial Officer

Andrew Young, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment:

- ***DRAFT Revenue Anticipation Bylaw No. 517, 2026***

VILLAGE OF SAYWARD

BYLAW NO. 517

A BYLAW TO PROVIDE FOR THE BORROWING OF MONEY IN ANTICIPATION OF REVENUE

WHEREAS the Village of Sayward may not have sufficient cash on hand to meet the current lawful expenditures of the municipality;

AND WHEREAS it is provided by Section 177 of the *Community Charter* that Council may, without the assent of the electors or the approval of the Inspector of Municipalities, provide for the borrowing of such sums of money as may be necessary to meet the current lawful expenditures of the municipality provided that the total of the outstanding liabilities does not exceed the sum of:

a.) The whole amount remaining unpaid of the taxes for all purposes levied during the current year, provided that prior to the adoption of the annual property tax bylaw in any year, the amount of the taxes during the current year for this purpose shall be deemed to be 75% of the taxes levied for all purposes in the immediately preceding year; and

b.) The whole amount of any sums of money remaining due from other governments;

AND WHEREAS there are no liabilities outstanding under Section 177;

AND WHEREAS the total amount of liability that Council may incur is eight hundred and ninety thousand dollars ($890,000) made up of the sum of four hundred and seventy thousand dollars ($470,000), being 75% of the whole amount of the taxes levied for all purposes in 2025, and four hundred and twenty thousand dollars ($420,000), being the whole amount of the sum of money remaining due from other governments;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Village of Sayward, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

1. This bylaw may be cited as **"Revenue Anticipation Bylaw No. 517, 2026".**

2. The Council shall be and is hereby empowered and authorized to borrow upon the credit of the municipality an amount or amounts not exceeding the sum of eight hundred and ninety thousand dollars ($890,000).

3. The form of obligation to be given as acknowledgement of the liability shall be a promissory note or notes bearing the corporate seal and signed by the Mayor and Financial Officer.

4. All unpaid taxes, the taxes of the current year when levied, and sums due from other governments or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall, when collected, be used to repay the money so borrowed.

5. All the monies so borrowed, and the interest payable thereon shall be payable on or before the 31st day of December 2026.

6. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this bylaw is for any reason held to be invalid by the decision of any Court of competent jurisdiction, the decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this bylaw.

Read a first time on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

Read a second time on the ____ day of _____ 20___.

Read a third time on the ____ day of _____ 20__.

Adopted on the ____ day of _____ 20__.

Certified a true copy of Bylaw No. 517 this ____ day of _____, _____

_____
Chief Administrative Officer
Village of Sayward

_____
Mayor

_____
Corporate Officer

DRAFT