



What shifts need to be made to the RDCK Climate Action Plan to move forward?

Notes collected from participants of the six dialogue circles hosted between August 9 and August 23.

Dialogue Circle 1 – Kaslo & Electoral Area D at Langham

- Support small local businesses
- Support circular economy – packaging & waste streams
- Advocacy & Influence – how does RDCK & residents have impact / work together outside of jurisdiction (i.e. clear cut logging)
Community Resilience – Issues other than climate change (i.e. housing, poverty, food/H2O supply)
- Sources & References
- Language sensitivity - Inclusivity
- Environmental protection education

- Dynamic nature built into plan
- Improved public transit system – especially for rural needs
- Real time data (i.e. dashboard)

- Further emphasize resilience – keep things liveable
- Building – fire resistant material for existing building
- Reducing heat in structures – materials, passive cooling
- Geohazard: recognize impact of deforestation
- Transportation – Shuttle (e.g. library/prescription drop off)
- Transportation – Carbon data sources (references for sources)
- Plan is only based on a single foundation/theory re. Greenhouse gases (GHG) runs the risk of creating other issues and not increase resilience.

- Build adaptability into the governance of the plan -> Continue dialogue circles-> Ongoing – can't be connected to budget approval/sharing(?)
- Varies times of day to accommodate life schedules
- Publishing data – dashboard – “Real-time”
- If the plan is adopted “as is”/edited, includes overarching statement with sub-regional statements/details
- Process: Community Action Days (Education/Hands on learning) Could be run by locally run organizations in the community
- Emphasize a culture of resilience (Volunteering)
- Courses (e.g. Food resilience)
- Explore use of tech for innovation/inclusion of ideas into businesses (link to resilience)

Dialogue Circle 2 – Boswell - Creston and Electoral Area's A, B, & C

- "...climate action imperative...applying a lens..." ultimate authority assumption.
 - What lens should/shouldn't government look through?
 - What are values, assumptions, lenses that the Climate Action Plan (CAP) is built on? What are the other lenses?
 - Use plain language that is clear and defined.
 - Lower income considerations – Elderly & without personal vehicles – access to health care, food etc.
 - How to assist immediate issues like watershed governance & influence BC province.
 - Provide proactive tool kits to the community to help navigate the process
 - Judy – What's missing?
-
- Page 8 – Transportation
 - Replace last action
 - Advocate for transportation
 - Energy studies for the Kootenay Region
 - Hydrogen Buses
 - Solutions -
 - Weekly education in local newspaper by RDCK
 - Audio info on radios
 - Scientists and old timers tell how it is
 - More on ground info – Local H2O issues
 - We are too isolated right now – where is our common weekly communication?
 - Lay person speak – tell us what is going on
 - Local Mel Reasoner, Rachel Holt, Greg Utig, Bob Sandford often heard voices. ????
-
- “Cultural change” – Mindset – Does community want this? Who decides? Why?
- Behind statement needs to change.
 - Culture is personal
 - Influence vs control -> Poor language
 - Common ground preserve air / water quality
 - “Climate Action Plan” language is top down & too “now”
 - Staff liaison “on the ground” with each community. Knows the community, knows the information, knows the organization
 - Meaningful engagement
 - Transparency & easy to understand government process. – What is within the RDCK control? Where advocate at other levels?
 - Identifying teams (SD8 plan)
 - Better imagery
 - “climate” definition

Dialogue Circle 3 - Winlaw Dialogue Circle – Electoral Area H & Slocan Valley

- Support local food supply
 - Bike shelter at bus stops
 - Bike racks on buses.
 - Improved transit services
 - Equity in H2O consumption/conservation
 - Crown-land use planning (Logging, Watershed activities, etc...)
 - Support for community groups & stakeholders (working with local experts – ex compost program, relationship – building, partnerships on advocacy)
 - Regenerative approach (soil, logging, farming, water capture)
-
- Inclusion of local voice in plan – local knowledge & experience
 - Consideration of regulation over citizens freedom & individuality
 - Improved transit system
 - Energy-system resilience & electricity reliability
 - Consideration of electrification sustainability & grid resilience
 - Consideration of cost of electricity vs other fuels
-
- RDCK advocate for healthy water (rivers, lakes)
 - Watershed protection (connection to forestry)
 - Farmers – support for local (livestock, food security)
 - 2 way street/consultation with farmers around water conservation
 - Subdivision process – land use planning/engagement of community
 - Alignment between climate action/bylaws/land use planning (both global, community based)
 - Community voice for issues governed by provincial/federal
-
- Bylaws = Oppression
 - Support for community organization instead
 - Consider common law over bylaw (experienced, hands-on, local voice)
 - Experts/tools/empowerment of community to promote regenerative solutions
 - Regenerative over restrictions
 - Language of plan very important – clarity simple language
 - Community involved in details of program outlay
 - Bear issue – work on solutions that decreases garden production
 - How to co-exist with wildlife
-
- Promote: Energy production (not just diesel generation), electric focus in plan (more focus on local solutions)
 - Electric Vehicle's (EV's) heavy, not feasible as a general solution
 - Fire suppression – neighborhood emergency preparedness & response

Dialogue Circle 4 - Burton Dialogue Circle – Nakusp & Electoral Area K

- Resources to support individual & community actions/efforts
 - Support for solar opportunities
 - Focus on community resiliency, preparedness, adaptability
 - Advocacy on watershed issues (loggings, slash burning etc.)
 - Increased consideration of Traditional knowledge
 - Advocacy or relationship building with enterprises (i.e. packaging waste)
 - Consideration of alternative waste management (i.e. waste to energy)
 - Circular economy
-
- Simplification of document
 - Explanation around language errors (i.e. 'Control')
 - Clarity on Transportation & Housing actions (i.e. capacity of residents to pay for EV's, energy retrofits)
 - Local applicability
 - Bike Path infrastructure – Advocacy to Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
 - Improved Recycling & Compost programs
 - Simplification of the content/language
 - Clarity of: What is mandated, what is enabling/supporting
 - Ban (as action) on pesticides/herbicides
 - Local power generation

Dialogue Circle 5 – Salmo, Nelson, & Electoral Area’s E, F, & G

- What are we asking/required?
 - What is mitigation vs response vs adaptation?
 - Vague working
 - Reduce intensity of language “switch & substantial”
 - More data to substitute claims & sources
 - E.g. Prohibitive costs
 - Full list of references
 - Diversity of perspectives in authorship of plan
 - Appreciate flexibility that allows for diversity of responses in different areas (area by area plans/actions)
-
- What shifts need to be made?
 - Examples of actions, what would this look like?
 - Creative ideas for transportation (for ex) thought experiments and spending
 - P5 – needs more explanation, ridership & emissions
 - Language must be rooted in rural perspective
 - P5 definition of equity & equality. Equity – concern, focus on outcome. Equality – Access.
 - Appreciation of graphic image
 - Be clear about jurisdiction RDCK or not
-
- How do we continue to refine & recognize it will take energy/cost? “Own the mess of this”
 - Need more information
 - Make area specific options, option for response hybrid of regional & area
 - P7 – projections are good – what would it cost to ↓temp & if this doesn’t work – what else?
 - Precautionary approach to do no harm
-
- Leadership & Operations
 - Asset management? – Creativity
 - Ensure sustainability of actions
 - Voluntary vs. regulated
 - Carrot rather than stick approach
 - Not really a ‘plan’ (step by step)
 - Vague
 - In person > online engagement
 - Residents appreciated being part of the conversation
-

Dialogue Circle 6 – Tarry’s Hall Castlegar & Electoral Areas I and J

- Not valid venue, not enough time to address this topic
 - What did the plan not do (e.g. Surveillance of residents)
 - What actions will have the biggest impact & prioritize
 - Acknowledge different models of science – e.g. Carbon may not be the issue and we will adapt & there is different contradictory science
 - Be really clear on how adoption of plan should happen
 - Should be brought to citizens for decision making
-
- Focus on specific actions – e.g. Wildfire, actions
 - Citizens advisory group to stay engaged & provide input & guidance
 - Love the distinction of jurisdiction influence/direct action
 - Actions should support guidance/suggestions – e.g. Have you thought about orienting your house for solar exposure
 - Mild plan that is informative
 - Do not see forced actions – good
 - Specific language about how to support farmers
 - Be clear about modelling that’s not proven
 - Uncertainties around relying on technologies that are un yet developed
-
- Rights to repair
 - P11 – Clarify action process / decision. Making e.g. 60% actions, 40% new (64. 36 new actions)
 - Basin Climate Source
 - Appreciate low carbon resilience
 - Appreciate pathways as focus, make it unique to RDCK rural communities
 - Clear of jurisdiction & support residents – choice – flexibility in language.
 - Emphasize personal choice & encourage people to consider giving up something – “sacrifice”
 - Articulate different views on climate crisis & it’s language
 - Include (un)actions on requisition
-
- Stay away from scary language. I.e. emergency/crisis
 - Less focus on carbon language
 - Carbon sinks
 - Clarification around compact communities
 - RDCK residents are considerate of stewardship & sustainability (environmentally responsible)
 - Community Led Actions
-
- More engagement with community
 - Iterative & collaborative approach is important
 - Carrot not the stick
 - Resident & local gov’t joint advocacy efforts
 - Clarity on climate adopted agriculture techniques
 - Support farmers to steward own resources (H2O)
 - Clarity on existing actions & previous public engagement
 - Consider embodied impact in consumption choices (retrofits, new/repaired vehicles)
 - Use rural life of RDCK as model