



## **CORPORATE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, February 27, 2020  
SCRD Boardroom, 1975 Field Road, Sechelt, B.C.**

### **AMENDED AGENDA**

---

**CALL TO ORDER      9:30 a.m.**

#### **AGENDA**

1. Adoption of Agenda

#### **PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

#### **REPORTS**

2. Corporate Officer  
Youth Appointments to Advisory Committees  
**(Voting – All Directors)**  
Annex A  
Pages 1-21
3. General Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Poverty Reduction Strategy for the Sunshine Coast Grant  
Application (District of Sechelt)  
**(Voting – All Directors)**  
Annex B  
pp. 22-32
4. General Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Sunshine Coast Regional District Arenas – Variable Ice Cost and  
2020 Spring Ice  
**(Voting – B, D, E, F, Sechelt, Gibsons, SIGD)**  
Annex C  
pp. 33-107
5. Manager, Protective Services  
Community Emergency Preparedness Fund – Application for  
Three Grants  
**(Voting – All Directors)**  
Annex D  
pp. 108-110
6. General Manager, Planning and Community Development  
Update on shishálh Nation Naming Referral and Highway Signs  
VERBAL

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

7. **⇒ADD** Raquel Kolof, Area E Resident and AAC Member  
Regarding: Objection to Youth Appointments to Advisory  
Committees  
**(Voting – All Directors)**  
pp. 111-112

**NEW BUSINESS****IN CAMERA**

That the public be excluded from attendance at the meeting in accordance with Section 90 (1) (k) of the *Community Charter* – “negotiations and related discussion respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public”.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**From:** Raquel Kolof

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2020 12:33:36 PM

**To:** Board Chair

**Subject:** [Sent to [board@scrd.ca](mailto:board@scrd.ca)] Objection to Youth Appointments to Advisory Committees

Objection to February 27, 2020 CAS Agenda Item: Youth Appointments to Advisory Committees.

As someone with a teaching degree, a Master's in Education, over 20 years teaching and counselling experience with adolescents in the secondary school system and a decade of sessional instructor experience in UBC's Faculty of Education, I think it is extremely ill advised to give students who are not yet able to vote, drive or who have not yet experienced independence, a VOTING position on the SCRD's advisory committees. I think it could be acceptable for grade 12's close to have a NON-VOTING seat but it is highly inappropriate to place 15-16 year old students on our advisory committees. This motion may have good intentions and feel good on the surface but is actually harmful to youth development and will have negative effects on advisory committees and SCRD policy.

1. The voting age in Canada is 18. Allowing voting privileges that inform regional politics to youth below the voting age is inappropriate and irresponsible.

2. We need to stop placing youth in adult roles before they are mature enough to handle these responsibilities and before they have developed sound decision making abilities. High school students, 15-17 year olds do not have the maturity or life experience needed to make informed decisions in civic politics. It is not beneficial for their development to place them in these positions prematurely. Youth need to earn their place in the adult world and grow into voting positions for the betterment of society. The fact that a grade 10 student's vote would have as much weight and be equal to mine, an experienced farmer, is actually offensive.

3. The purpose of these committees is to advise and inform the Regional District, NOT to teach youth about civic politics. It is not the job of SCRD staff or other advisory committee members to educate youth on civic politics or agriculture. In the SCRD Ag Advisory committee adults volunteer our time and energy in these unpaid positions. It is unreasonable to ask that we now educate youth on the topics on our agenda which we would have to do as there is no way they would have any idea what exclusion applications are or even about the ALR or the ALC. It is the school systems job to educate. Why are we expecting kids to be in civic roles during high school? High school is hard enough. I agree that engaging youth in politics is critical to our future. So is epidemiology, but that doesn't mean we put high school students in voting positions on hospital boards.

4. We need experienced and educated adults on advisory committees. At the District A Farmers Institute meeting with over 15 Farmers Institutes from Vancouver Island, Gulf Islands and coastal communities in attendance, the issue of AAC's being populated with people who are not involved in agriculture was noted. Some AAC's are revisiting their terms of service to ensure that the majority of people sitting on AAC's are actually involved in agriculture, that is the growing and selling of food not just as a lifestyle but as a career. At present we have vacancies on our AAC. So the possibility that the AAC would be populated by more voting members who lack experience and knowledge makes me uneasy to say the least. Students are welcome to give ideas on what they know best, such as school board advisory councils and various other committees in their own schools but NOT Regional District's agricultural advisory committees.

5. There is an issue with lack of civic education in our school system and as someone who has taught in high schools for the last 20 years I know it too well. But this move is not the answer. The students who are interested in civics and government are already taking Law 12 and Social Justice 12 and all the other related courses. You will not attract the kids who have to head right to work after school to help their families make ends meet. We need to support the school system in this matter not try to do it's job for a select few.

6. This motion is applying an highly inappropriate remedy to achieve the goals of engaged citizenry. Why not focus on engaging the citizens who are eligible to vote, such as the 18-20 year olds and focus on filling the empty seats currently existing on these committees. Giving students who have no life experience or expertise in these areas a VOTING seat is so highly inappropriate and offensive to the other educated adults on these committees.

We need to get students engaged in voting and civics in the appropriate place, within their own schools. Teachers and school staff do this all the time. With this motion, the SCR D is now trying to take on the roles and responsibilities of the school system and I think its highly ill advised. How about the regional district hire students as summer interns? That is the way to go, NOT voting seats for high school students who have no knowledge or experience on the subjects they are voting on.

Regards,

Raquel Kolof  
Area E Resident and AAC Member

---

This email was scanned by Bitdefender