



Regional District of Central Kootenay
CASTLEGAR AND DISTRICT RECREATION COMMISSION
Open Meeting Agenda

Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2026

Time: 4:00 pm

Directors will have the opportunity to participate in the meeting electronically. Proceedings are open to the public.

Pages

1. ZOOM REMOTE MEETING INFO

To promote openness, transparency and provide accessibility to the public we provide the ability to attend all RDCK meetings in-person or remote (hybrid model).

Meeting Time:

4:00 p.m. PDT

Join by Video:

<https://rdck-bc-ca.zoom.us/j/95743816940?pwd=LHoBT3OXNb055aFYazewDPN8ywsKPD.1>

Join by Phone:

1 833 958 1164 Canada Toll-free

*6 to unmute or mute

*9 to raise or lower your hand

Meeting ID: 957 4381 6940

Meeting Password: 480871

In-Person Location: Castlegar & District Community Complex - 2101 6th Avenue - Columbia Room

2. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bogle called the meeting to order at [Time] p.m.

3. TRADITIONAL LANDS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

We acknowledge and respect the Indigenous peoples within whose traditional lands we are meeting today.

4. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION:

The agenda for the June 02, 2026 Castlegar and District Recreation Commission meeting be adopted as circulated.

5. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

3 - 10

The May 25, 2026 Castlegar and District Recreation Commission minutes, have been received.

6. DELEGATE

There are no Delegates scheduled for this Commission meeting.

7. STAFF REPORTS

7.1 Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project – Timeline Update

11 - 14

The Commission Report dated June 2, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project – Timeline Update, has been received.

7.2 Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project: Naming Rights Guideline Update

15 - 22

The Commission Report dated June 2, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services re: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project: Naming Rights Guideline Update, has been received.

8. PUBLIC TIME

The Chair will call for questions from the public and members of the media at _____ p.m.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next Castlegar and District Recreation Commission meeting is scheduled for July 7, 2026 at 4:00 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

RECOMMENDATION:

The Castlegar and District Recreation Commission meeting be adjourned at [Time].



REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL KOOTENAY

**CASTLEGAR & DISTRICT RECREATION COMMISSION
OPEN MEETING MINUTES**

**4:00 p.m.
May 25, 2026**

To promote openness, transparency and provide accessibility to the public we provide the ability to attend all RDCK meetings in-person or remote (hybrid model).

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Member M. McFaddin	City of Castlegar
Commissioner Member B. Bogle	City of Castlegar
Commissioner Member H. Hanegraaf	Director Area J
Commissioner Member S. Heaton-Sherstobitoff	City of Castlegar

MEMBERS ABSENT

Commissioner Member A. Davidoff	Director Area I
---------------------------------	-----------------

STAFF

Trisha Davison	General Manager of Community Services
Yev Mallov	General Manager of Finance
Craig Stanley	Regional Manager of Operations and Asset Management
AJ Evenson	Senior Project Manager
Jenna Chapman	Meeting Coordinator

GUESTS

Chris Barlow	City of Castlegar CAO
--------------	-----------------------

4 out of 5 voting Commission members were present – quorum was met.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bogle called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. TRADITIONAL LANDS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT STATEMENT

We acknowledge and respect the Indigenous peoples within whose traditional lands we are meeting today.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Agenda for the May 25, 2026 Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting, be adopted as circulated.

Carried

4. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

The May 05, 2026 Castlegar and District Recreation Commission minutes have been received.

5. DELEGATE

There are no Delegates scheduled for this Commission meeting.

6. STAFF REPORTS

6.1 Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project Financial Update

The Commission Report dated May 25, 2026 from Yev Malloff, General Manager, Finance, IT & Procurement re: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project Financial Update, has been received.

Freedom of the Floor

City of Castlegar CAO, Chris Barlow have freedom of the floor.

- Staff provided an update on the legal review and project budget analysis, including the addition of a 10% owner's contingency to address project risks and unforeseen costs.
- Additional project costs are proposed to be funded through taxation and a construction loan, allowing borrowing costs to be repaid through future requisitions.
- Commissioners noted that grant funding confirmation is required prior to referendum and before adoption of the 2027 Financial Plan.
- Discussion clarified that the current project budget reflects a potential total cost of approximately \$17.5 million, inclusive of contingencies.
- Commissioners discussed the appropriateness of the 10% contingency, noting it aligns with industry best practices while acknowledging higher contingencies could further mitigate risk.
- Questions were raised regarding opportunities to adjust project funding allocations, including the potential use of grant funding or existing service contributions to reduce borrowing and taxation impacts.
- Commissioners expressed support for advancing the project, recognizing that detailed project and financial information will be communicated through the public engagement process.
- Proposed next steps include issuance of the RFPQ, contingent upon Board approval, followed by a short evaluation period and presentation of qualified proponents to the Commission and Board in July.
- Staff noted project timelines may require a special Commission meeting and are committed to providing a further update, including referendum timing considerations, at an upcoming meeting.

Moved and seconded,
AND Resolved that it be recommended to the Board:

That the Board approve an additional \$2,509,000 funding from Taxation be included in the Draft Financial Plan for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project as outlined in the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Report dated May 25, 2026.

Carried

7. PUBLIC TIME

The Chair will call for questions from the public at 4:29 p.m.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2026 at 4:00 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting be adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Carried

Digitally Approved

B. Bogle, Chair

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. That the Board approve an additional \$2,509,000 funding from Taxation be included in the Draft Financial Plan for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project as outlined in the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Report dated May 25, 2026.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE PROVIDED FOR CONVENIENCE ONLY AND WILL BE CONSIDERED AT ITS APPROPRIATE MEETING AS STATED.

Future Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Meetings

1. *N/A*



Commission Report

May 25, 2026

Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project Financial Update

Author: Yev Malloff, General Manager, Finance, IT & Procurement
File Reference: 2026-05-25
Electoral Area/Municipality: City of Castlegar, Area I & Area J
Services Impacted: To Be Established

1.0 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve an additional \$2,509,000 of funding from Taxation be included in the Draft Financial Plan for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project as outlined in the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Report dated May 25, 2026.

2.0 BACKGROUND/HISTORY

Staff have identified a total funding requirement of \$2,789,000 for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project (the "Project") that is the responsibility of the RDCK and falls outside the design-build proponent's contract scope. Of this amount, \$280,000 relates to the approved 2026 procurement and Owner's Statement of Requirements (OSR) development costs. The \$280,000 in 2026 costs were expected to be recovered through taxation in the new service if the Project proceeds. The remaining \$2,509,000 was not included in the draft Financial Plan presented with the May 5, 2026 Commission report. Detailed amounts are below:

Capital Expenditures - RDCK	
City of Castlegar Building Permit (on \$18M)	144,000
FF&E (Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment)	100,000
Watermain & Hydrant Relocation	300,000
New 600v Electrical Service	175,000
Geotech & Environmental Testing	90,000
Traffic Flow Study	25,000
Asbestos Remediation	50,000
Quality Control Testing & Inspections	125,000
Commissioning Agent	150,000
Owner's Contingency (10% of construction)	1,350,000
Subtotal	2,509,000
2026 Procurement (including OSR)	280,000
Total	2,789,000

3.0 PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

The proposed \$15,000,000 borrowing amount is already constrained for the design-build component. Deducting the \$2,509,000 of RDCK-retained construction costs would leave approximately \$12,491,000 for the design-build proponent, increasing the risk that qualified firms cannot submit a compliant proposal.

The opportunity is to fund the \$2,509,000 from taxation during the first three years of the new Arena and Walking Track service (if approved through voter assent), while principal repayment on the \$15,000,000 borrowing is deferred through phased draws and MFABC temporary borrowing. The May 22, 2026 Draft Financial Plan projects annual taxation on the average residential property at approximately \$168 during the first three years, within the \$150 to \$199 range identified through previous public engagement for recreation services.

3.1 Alignment to Board Strategic Plan

Supports Organizational Excellence and meeting resident service needs through planned infrastructure investment.

3.2 Legislative Considerations

Local Government Act requirements for service establishment, loan authorization and elector assent; applicable Community Charter financial planning and borrowing provisions.

3.3 What Are the Risks

The main risk is that no qualified firm is able or willing to submit a compliant proposal at the \$15,000,000 design-build amount; that risk increases if the available design-build budget is reduced to approximately \$12,491,000.

4.0 PROPOSED SOLUTION

Staff recommend using taxation to fund the \$2,509,000 of additionally identified RDCK-retained construction costs. This approach preserves the full \$15,000,000 design-build budget and provides a greater likelihood of receiving a compliant proposal than funding these costs from the borrowing proceeds.

4.1 Financial Considerations of the Proposed Solution

The attached Draft Financial Plan outlines the flow of funds for the Project and the new service (if approved through voter assent), using taxation to fund the \$2,509,000 of identified RDCK-retained construction costs. \$1,350,000 is an owner's contingency; if not required, it would be used to reduce future requisitions or otherwise returned to the service in accordance with Committee and Board direction.

Temporary borrowing through MFABC postpones principal repayment until 2030, leaving room in the early years of the Financial Plan for taxation to fund the additional RDCK-retained costs.

4.2 Risks with the Proposed Solution

The risk is that residents may not support taxation on the average residential property of approximately \$168 annually during the construction period, even though this remains within the \$150 to \$199 range identified through the public engagement process.

4.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

The funding approach would not have a material impact on workplans beyond the Project work already under way.

4.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

The public benefit is a new recreation facility that responds to needs identified through previous community engagement. If a successful proponent is selected, further public engagement will be required so residents understand the Project scope, financial implications and approval process before the public assent vote.

4.5 Leveraging Technology

N/A

4.6 Measuring Success

Success will be measured by selection of a qualified proponent and acceptable design, approval through the public assent process, and successful construction of the facility within the approved scope and budget.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION(S)

Fund the \$2,509,000 of RDCK-retained construction costs from the \$15,000,000 borrowing proceeds.

5.1 Financial Considerations of the Alternative Solution(s)

This would leave approximately \$12,491,000 available for the design-build firm, reducing the likelihood of receiving a compliant proposal.

5.2 Risks with the Alternative Solution(s)

No design-build firm submits a compliant proposal to complete the Project within the reduced design-build budget.

5.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

N/A

5.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Alternative Solution(s)

Lower probability of a successful Project proceeding to a public assent vote and construction.

5.5 Measuring Success

Successful construction of a new facility within the reduced design-build budget.

6.0 OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT NOT PRESENTED

Increase the borrowing proceeds to \$17,509,000. This option is not presented because it would alter the previously communicated borrowing and taxation assumptions and would require reconsideration of the assent strategy.

7.0 OPTIONS SUMMARY

Option 1:

Recommendation:

That the Board approve an additional \$2,509,000 of funding from Taxation be included in the Draft Financial Plan for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project as outlined in the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Report dated May 25, 2026.

Option 2:

Recommendation:

That the additional \$2,509,000 of RDCK-retained funding requirements for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project be funded from the \$15,000,000 borrowing amount already identified for the Project.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve an additional \$2,509,000 of funding from Taxation be included in the Draft Financial Plan for the Castlegar and District Arena and Walking Track Project as outlined in the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Report dated May 25, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Yev Malloff

Yev Malloff, General Manager, Finance, IT & Procurement

CONCURRENCE

CAO – Stuart Horn – Digitally Approved

Regional Manager Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley – Digitally Approved

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Draft Financial Plan – May 22, 2026

**Attachment A - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track
Draft Financial Plan - May 22, 2026**

Income	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	Totals
Requisitions (Taxation)		1,394,238	1,389,150	1,388,784	1,303,074	1,290,547	1,292,570	1,294,644	1,299,269	1,301,447	1,303,680	13,257,403
Grants												-
Proceeds From Borrowing		8,585,000	5,960,000	455,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,000,000
Investment Income & Interest					2,288	4,633	7,036	9,500	9,525	12,113	14,766	59,859
Transfer from Reserves		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	100,000
Transfer from Community Works												-
Prior Year Surplus/(Deficit)		(280,000)										(280,000)
	-	9,699,238	7,349,150	1,843,784	1,305,361	1,295,180	1,299,606	1,304,143	1,408,794	1,313,560	1,318,446	28,137,262
Expenses												
Contracted Services					10,000	10,250	10,506	10,769	11,038	11,314	11,597	75,474
Debenture/Financing Interest		150,238	404,775	525,000	731,744	731,744	731,744	731,744	731,744	731,744	731,744	6,202,221
Debenture/Financing Principal					386,382	386,382	386,382	386,382	386,382	386,382	386,382	2,704,674
Contribution to Reserve					91,506	93,794	96,139	98,542	101,006	103,531	106,119	690,638
Transfer to Other Service					14,500							14,500
Transfer to General Admin Fee		20,000	20,500	21,013	21,538	22,076	22,628	23,194	23,774	24,368	24,977	224,068
Transfer to Community Services		35,000	35,875	36,772	37,691	38,633	39,599	40,589	41,604	42,644	43,710	392,118
Transfer to Project Management		50,000	50,000	25,000								125,000
Transfer to Asset Management			3,000	6,000	12,000	12,300	12,608	12,923	13,246	13,577	13,916	99,569
Capital Expenditures - RDCK - Asset Management					-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	100,000
Capital Expenditures - RDCK - Construction	280,000	1,444,000	835,000	230,000								2,789,000
Capital Expenditures - Design/Build		8,000,000	6,000,000	1,000,000								15,000,000
	280,000	9,699,238	7,349,150	1,843,784	1,305,361	1,295,180	1,299,606	1,304,143	1,408,794	1,313,560	1,318,446	28,417,262
Surplus/(Deficit)	(280,000)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(280,000)
Capital Expenditures - RDCK - Construction												
2026 Procurement (including OSR)	280,000											280,000
City of Castlegar Building Permit (on \$18M)		144,000										144,000
FF&E (Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment)				100,000								100,000
Watermain & Hydrant Relocation		300,000										300,000
New 600v Electrical Service		175,000										175,000
Geotech & Environmental Testing		90,000										90,000
Traffic Flow Study		25,000										25,000
Asbestos Remediation				50,000								50,000
Quality Control Testing & Inspections				125,000								125,000
Commissioning Agent		60,000		30,000								150,000
Owner's Contingency (10% of construction)		650,000		100,000								1,350,000
	280,000	1,444,000	835,000	230,000								2,789,000
Capital Expenditures - Design/Build												2,509,000
Design		1,500,000										1,500,000
Build		6,500,000	6,000,000	1,000,000								13,500,000
	-	8,000,000	6,000,000	1,000,000								15,000,000
Taxation Data												
Residential Assessment Value - Area J - \$000		1,142,680	1,171,247	1,200,528	1,230,541	1,261,305	1,292,838	1,325,158	1,358,287	1,392,245	1,427,051	
Residential Assessment Value - Castlegar - \$000		3,176,954	3,256,378	3,337,787	3,421,232	3,506,763	3,594,432	3,684,293	3,776,400	3,870,810	3,967,580	
Residential Assessment Value - Total - \$000		4,319,634	4,427,625	4,538,315	4,651,773	4,768,068	4,887,269	5,009,451	5,134,687	5,263,055	5,394,631	
Taxation \$/000		0.323	0.314	0.306	0.280	0.271	0.264	0.258	0.253	0.247	0.242	
Average Residential Property Value - \$		520,200	533,205	546,535	560,199	574,203	588,559	603,273	618,354	633,813	649,659	
Annual Taxation on Average Residential Property - \$		168	167	167	157	155	156	156	156	157	157	



Commission Report – For Information

June 2, 2026

Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project – Timeline Update

Author:	Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services
File Reference:	01-0520-50
Electoral Area/Municipality:	City of Castlegar, Area I & Area J
Services Impacted	S222

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To update the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission on the status and process associated with the referendum timeline for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Expansion project.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND UPDATE

As the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track project continues to move towards a referendum, a update on the timeline, in particular related to key milestones, will continue to be provided to Commission monthly. The attached chart provides an outline as to the key initiatives and where they are at as of the time of writing this report.

Some specific timeline highlights are as follows:

- The RFPQ was issued publicly on May 29 and will remain open for submissions until June 26.
- The Service Establishment Bylaw (SEB) and Loan Authorization (LA) Bylaw will be presented to the Board on June 18, accompanied by a staff report. Any required revisions must be finalized by July 2.
- The SEB and LA bylaws are scheduled for third reading at the July Board meeting. Once third reading is complete, no further changes can be made to the borrowing or taxation amounts.
- On July 23, the bylaws and supporting documentation will be submitted to the Inspector for review and approval. Significant attention has been given to meeting the Inspector's requirements in reporting.
- In August, the Assent Vote materials and required resolution will be drafted. A legal opinion will be obtained if deemed necessary.
- Staff anticipate receiving statutory approval by September 18.
- On September 24, the Assent Vote resolution and ballot question will be presented to the Board for approval.
- Public notice specific to referendum logistics (this separate from public engagement) will be issued in late October and again in mid-November.
- General Voting Day is scheduled for November 28.
- Official results will be declared no later than November 30.

It is important to note there continues to be very quick turnaround times at key milestones in the project. The updated timeline provided is based on information staff have as of the end of May 2026.

Public Engagement Plan Update

Staff are in the early stages of planning for community engagement, should the project proceed to a referendum. We have requested a proposal from HCMA to support public engagement activities. They will be providing a detailed submission outlining the cost, along with their recommended approach to delivering the proposed scope of work.

Depending on the overall cost, there may be a need to scale back some of the proposed engagement tactics to align with budget realities. As more information is gathered, staff will bring back options for consideration by Commission.

HCMA has been approached directly due to the tight timeline associated with a potential November 28 referendum. Conducting a full Request for Proposals process for public consultation services would not be feasible within this timeframe. Additionally, HCMA is already engaged on this project, making them well-positioned to support an expanded scope of work.

Proposed Scope of Engagement Support

The below are the high-level engagement tactics staff have proposed to HCMA for a public engagement.

Engagement Tactics

1. Community Meetings
 - Three (3) community meetings in Castlegar and Area J
2. Pop-ups
 - Three to five pop-ups in high traffic areas around Castlegar and Area J (grocery stores, community events, community complex)
3. Digital Engagement
 - Using social media to post static and video content about the project (project details, the cost to taxpayers etc)
 - Use engage.rdck.ca as the key spot for project information
4. Advertising and Promotions
 - Mailout, posters, sandwich boards, highway signs, postcards, print ads
5. Communication Materials
 - FAQ's, panels, handouts

Preliminary Timeline

The proposed timeline of engagement is to run from October 7 – November 27. It is important to note staff are currently targeting to commence engagement at a time that will overlap with the local government election in mid October.

3.0 NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

A timeline update report will continue to be provided to the Commission at their next Commission meeting.


Respectfully submitted,




Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

Regional Manager, Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley 

Senior Project Manager – AJ Evenson 

Regional Manager, Recreation & Client Services – Kristi Calder 

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Timeline Update

Appendix A: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project Timeline Update – June 2, 2026

TASK DESCRIPTION		PLANNED START	DURATION (DAYS)	PLANNED END	STATUS
OVERALL PROCUREMENT PROCESS		2026-02-01	302	2026-11-30	
PRE-PROCUREMENT: FOUNDATIONAL DOCUMENTS		2026-02-01	152	2026-07-03	
3	Naming Rights +Value Capture Guideline — Development & Drafting	2026-02-01	30	2026-03-03	Complete
4	Naming Rights +Value Capture Guideline — Adoption	2026-03-19	1	2026-03-20	Complete
5	Wood Integration Guideline - Development & Drafting	2026-02-01	30	2026-03-03	Complete
6	Wood Integration Guideline - Adoption	2026-03-19	1	2026-03-20	Complete
10	Project Charter — Drafting	2026-03-12	2	2026-03-14	Complete
12	Master Schedule Development	2026-03-12	10	2026-03-22	Complete
13	Procurement Budget Preparation	2026-03-12	10	2026-03-22	Complete
14	Risk Register — Initial Development	2026-03-12	10	2026-03-22	Complete
DESIGN - DEVELOPMENT OF OWNERS STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS		2026-02-10	110	2026-05-31	
16-1	Site Meeting	2026-02-10	1	2026-02-11	Complete
16-2	Refine concept design	2026-02-19	15	2026-03-06	Complete
16-3	Develop OSR	2026-02-19	10	2026-03-01	Complete
16-4	Owners Review of OSR	2026-03-02	75	2026-05-16	Complete
16-5	Incorporate OSR Edits from Owners Review	2026-05-16	15	2026-05-31	Complete
STAGE 1: REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFPQ)		2026-03-12	128	2026-07-18	
17	RFPQ Document — Drafting	2026-03-12	50	2026-05-01	Complete
18	RFPQ Document — Legal Review	2026-05-01	20	2026-05-21	Complete
19	RFPQ Submission Form, evaluation criteria and panel- Development	2026-04-15	2	2026-04-17	Complete
23	RFPQ — Publication & Administration	2026-05-27	27	2026-06-23	In Progress
24	Proponent Q&A / Addenda Management	2026-06-09	10	2026-06-19	Not Started
26	RFQ Evaluation — Scoring & Consensus	2026-06-30	4	2026-07-04	Not Started
27	Reference Checks	2026-07-04	1	2026-07-05	Not Started
28	Shortlist Recommendation Report	2026-07-04	2	2026-07-06	Not Started
29	Board Approval — Shortlist	2026-07-16	1	2026-07-17	Not Started
30	Debrief Letters — Unsuccessful Respondents	2026-07-17	1	2026-07-18	Not Started
STAGE 2: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)		2026-05-21	128	2026-09-26	
31	Honorarium / Participation Agreement — Drafting	2026-05-21	2	2026-05-23	In Progress
32	Honorarium Agreement — Legal Review	2026-05-23	5	2026-05-28	In Progress
33	Honorarium Agreement — Execution with Proponents	2026-07-18	5	2026-07-23	In Progress
34	RFP Document — Drafting	2026-05-21	10	2026-05-31	In Progress
35	RFP Document — Legal Review	2026-05-31	20	2026-06-20	In Progress
41	RFP — Issuance to Shortlisted Proponents	2026-07-20	60	2026-09-18	Not Started
42	RFP — Proponent Q&A / Addenda Management	2026-07-20	60	2026-09-18	Not Started
43	Collaborative Design Sessions (HCMA)	2026-08-04	4	2026-08-08	Not Started
44	RFP Evaluation — Design / Technical Scoring	2026-09-18	1	2026-09-19	Not Started
45	RFP Evaluation — Commercial / Price Scoring	2026-09-18	1	2026-09-19	Not Started
46	RFP Evaluation — Interviews / Presentations	2026-09-23	1	2026-09-24	Not Started
47	RFP Evaluation — Consensus & Final Ranking	2026-09-25	1	2026-09-26	Not Started
STAGE 3: PREFERRED PROPONENT SELECTION		2026-09-26	5	2026-10-01	
50	Evaluation Report — Preparation	2026-09-26	1	2026-09-27	Not Started
51	Staff Report to Board — Selection Recommendation	2026-09-27	1	2026-09-28	Not Started
52	Board Resolution — Conditional Selection - Special Board Mtg	2026-09-30	1	2026-10-01	Not Started
STAGE 4: FINANCIAL PLANNING & BYLAW DRAFTING		2026-02-26	140	2026-07-16	
62	Service Establishment Bylaw — Drafting	2026-02-26	97	2026-06-03	In Progress
63	Loan Authorization Bylaw — Drafting	2026-02-26	97	2026-06-03	In Progress
65	Board Report & First / Second / Third Readings	2026-05-25	52	2026-07-16	In Progress
STAGE 5: INSPECTOR OF MUNICIPALITIES REVIEW		2026-07-23	57	2026-09-18	
68	Inspector Approval	2026-07-23	57	2026-09-18	Not Started
STAGE 6: PUBLIC CONSULTATION		2026-10-07	45	2026-11-21	
70	Public Consultation	2026-10-07	45	2026-11-21	Not Started
STAGE 7: VOTER ASSENT (REFERENDUM)					
80	Assent Vote Board Resolution Approval	2026-09-09	15	2026-09-24	Not Started
81	Resolution — Drafting	2026-08-04	14	2026-08-18	Not Started
82	Resolution — Legal Review	2026-08-18	10	2026-08-28	Not Started
83	Public Notice	2026-10-01	58	2026-11-28	Not Started
84	Assent Vote	2026-09-18	71	2026-11-28	Not Started
85	Results Declaration	2026-11-30	0	2026-11-30	Not Started



Commission Report – For Information

June 2, 2026

Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project: Naming Rights Guideline Update

Author:	Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services
File Reference:	01-0520-50
Electoral Area/Municipality:	City of Castlegar, Area I & Area J
Services Impacted	S222

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide Commission with the updated version of the Naming Rights Guideline that has been developed to support the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track expansion project.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND UPDATE

At the March 3, 2026 meeting of the Castlegar & District Recreation Commission, staff presented a report on Value Capture Guidelines and Naming Rights for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track project. The recommendations outlined in that report were subsequently approved by the Board at its March 19 meeting.

Appendix B of the staff report included draft Naming Rights Guidelines for this project. As part of the development of the Request for Pre-Qualifications (RFPQ) documents, these guidelines underwent legal review. As a result, several minor revisions were recommended and have since been incorporated into the final version of the Naming Rights Guidelines for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project. A summary of the changes that have been incorporated into the final version of the document is as follows:

1. Addition of Items (b) and (c) under Section 2: Acceptable Name Criteria
 - (b) **Reflection on Regional District:** Names that could reflect negatively on the Regional District’s public image or prove detrimental to the Regional District’s integrity or reputation shall not be approved.
 - (c) **Divisiveness:** Names that promote religious, political, or potentially divisive messages specific to any group or subgroup shall not be approved.
2. Clarification in Section 3: Board Approval Process as to what would occur if the Board rejects a proposed name and the proponent requests mediation but that mediation does not resolve the dispute.
 - o *If mediation does not resolve the dispute, the matter will be referred to a single arbitrator under the Arbitration Act.*

3. Section 5: Community Consultation – additional statement added noting these guidelines are subject to change after public consultation is completed.
 - *Therefore these guidelines are subject to change after public consultation is completed.*
4. Section 7: Transferability and Assignment – clarification that the naming rights holder may assign or transfer the commercial naming rights to a third party with Board approval, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. However, this must be approved by the Board.
5. Section 8: Reversion Triggers

Naming rights revert to the RDCK before term expiry under any of the following circumstances:

 - Item 8 (c) added:
The named entity takes action to bring the Regional District into disrepute or that otherwise conflict with the Regional District’s values, policies or community standards.
 - General Statement added:
The Regional District will not be liable for any reputational or financial losses resulting from termination.

3.0 NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

This document forms part of the Request for Pre-Qualifications (RFPQ) package that has been released to the public as of May 29, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

Regional Manager of Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley 
 Regional Manager of Recreation & Client Services – Kristi Calder



ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Naming Rights Guideline: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project (PRJ#25033)



Naming Rights Guideline

Castlegar & District Arena
and Walking Track Project
Project #: PRJ25033

Table of Contents

1	Purpose and Scope	3
2	Acceptable Name Criteria	3
3	Board Approval Process	3
4	Self-Naming Provisions	4
5	Community Consultation	4
6	Naming Rights Term	4
7	Transferability and Assignment	4
8	Reversion Triggers	5
9	Conditions for Renaming During the Term	5
10	Benefactor Scenario	5
11	Signage and Design Standards	5
12	RDCK Branding Integration	6
13	Legal Framework	6

NOTE: These guidelines are project-specific to the Castlegar & District Arena and Indoor Walking Track design-build procurement. They are not an organization-wide facility naming policy.

1 Purpose and Scope

These Naming Rights Guidelines establish the framework for the naming of the Castlegar & District Arena. They apply to the primary facility name only. Sub-facility naming (individual rinks, rooms, lobbies, and gathering spaces) is excluded from the proponent’s naming rights and is retained by the RDCK as a separate matter.

If the Board approves the inclusion of naming rights in the design-build procurement, these guidelines govern the naming rights transferred to the successful proponent. If the Board excludes naming rights from the procurement, these guidelines govern whatever separate naming process the Commission undertakes after the project proceeds.

These guidelines may be amended by Board resolution at any time, provided that amendments do not retroactively impair naming rights that have been contractually transferred to a proponent under an executed Naming Rights Agreement.

2 Acceptable Name Criteria

A proposed facility name must satisfy all of the following criteria to be approved by the Board:

- a. **Community Standards:** The name must be consistent with the standards expected of a public recreation facility used by families, children, and community groups. Names that are vulgar, discriminatory, or offensive shall not be approved.
- b. **Reflection on Regional District:** Names that could reflect negatively on the Regional District’s public image or prove detrimental to the Regional District’s integrity or reputation shall not be approved.
- c. **Divisiveness:** Names that promote religious, political, or potentially divisive messages specific to any group or subgroup shall not be approved.
- d. **Prohibited Industries:** The facility shall not be named after or associated with entities primarily engaged in the following industries: tobacco products; cannabis production or retail (recreational); firearms or weapons manufacturing; gambling or gaming operations (other than government-operated lotteries); adult entertainment; or any industry that is illegal under Canadian federal or provincial law.
- e. **Good Standing:** The naming entity (whether a corporation, organization, or individual) must be in good legal and financial standing. Entities that are subject to material criminal proceedings, regulatory sanctions, or insolvency proceedings shall not be approved for facility naming.
- f. **Name Format:** The name must include the word “Arena” or an equivalent term that identifies the facility’s primary function (e.g., “[Name] Arena”, “[Name] Recreation Centre”). The name must not exceed a reasonable length for signage and public communication purposes.

3 Board Approval Process

The naming rights holder submits a proposed name to the RDCK in writing. Staff review the proposed name against these guidelines criteria and prepare a recommendation to the Board within 30 days of receipt.

The Board considers the proposed name at the next regular Board meeting following staff's recommendation, with a decision within 90 days of the initial submission. If the Board rejects a proposed name, the naming rights holder may submit up to two alternative names, each subject to the same review process and timeline. If three successive names are rejected, the naming rights holder may request mediation. If mediation does not resolve the dispute, the matter will be referred to a single arbitrator under the *Arbitration Act*.

The Castlegar & District Recreation Commission shall review naming proposals and provide a recommendation to the Board before the Board's consideration, given the Commission's oversight of the arena service.

4 Self-Naming Provisions

A proponent may name the facility after their own company, subject to the same acceptable name criteria and Board approval process. Where the proponent proposes self-naming, additional review is warranted to ensure that the naming rights discount reflected in Price B represents fair market value for the naming opportunity — that is, the proponent is not receiving a below-market bargain by naming the facility after themselves.

If the Price A / Price B gap appears inconsistent with market comparables for naming rights, the evaluation committee may request that the proponent provide evidence of the commercial basis for the naming rights value attributed in their pricing.

5 Community Consultation

The public consultation at Stage 6 of the procurement (prior to the referendum) shall include information about the naming rights mechanism, these guidelines, and the Board's approval authority. The community should have an opportunity to comment on the type of naming they find acceptable, even if the specific name will not be known at that stage. Therefore these guidelines are subject to change after public consultation is completed.

Once a specific name is proposed by the naming rights holder after substantial completion, the Commission may choose to conduct additional community consultation before making its recommendation to the Board, but this is not mandatory under these guidelines.

6 Naming Rights Term

The naming rights term is 20–25 years from the date of substantial completion of the facility. Upon expiry, naming rights revert automatically to the RDCK without compensation to the naming rights holder. The RDCK is then free to conduct a new naming process, extend the arrangement by mutual agreement, or assign a community name.

The specific term within the 20–25 year range shall be established in the Naming Rights Agreement negotiated at Stage 9 of the procurement.

7 Transferability and Assignment

The naming rights holder may assign or transfer the commercial naming rights to a third party with Board approval, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. However, every proposed name — whether from the original holder or an assignee — must be approved by the Board under these guidelines before it is applied to the facility.

The RDCK must be notified in writing of all transfers within 30 days of completion. The assignee assumes all obligations of the naming rights holder under the Naming Rights Agreement and these guidelines.

8 Reversion Triggers

Naming rights revert to the RDCK before term expiry under any of the following circumstances:

- a. The naming rights are not exercised (no name applied) within 24 months after substantial completion.
- b. The named entity becomes unacceptable under these guidelines (e.g., convicted of a criminal offence, enters an excluded industry) and the naming rights holder does not propose an acceptable alternative name within 180 days of notice from the RDCK.
- c. The named entity takes action to bring the Regional District into disrepute or that otherwise conflict with the Regional District's values, policies or community standards,
- d. The naming rights holder becomes insolvent or enters bankruptcy proceedings.
- e. The Naming Rights Agreement is terminated for material breach.
- f. By mutual written agreement between the RDCK and the naming rights holder.

Upon reversion, the RDCK regains full naming rights without compensation to the naming rights holder (the holder already received value through the construction price discount). The proponent's construction obligations under the CCDCC contract are unaffected by reversion. The costs of physical signage removal and replacement shall be borne by the naming rights holder unless reversion is by mutual agreement, in which case costs shall be allocated as agreed.

The Regional District will not be liable for any reputational or financial losses resulting from termination.

9 Conditions for Renaming During the Term

If the named entity becomes controversial after the name is applied — for example, involvement in a public scandal, criminal charges against key individuals, or activities that conflict with these guidelines — the Board may require removal of the name by providing written notice to the naming rights holder specifying the grounds.

The naming rights holder has 180 days from receipt of notice to propose an acceptable alternative name. If no acceptable alternative is proposed within that period, the naming rights revert to the RDCK under Section 8(b) above.

10 Benefactor Scenario

A proponent or community member may offer a substantial philanthropic contribution in exchange for naming recognition. Where the naming rights are included in the procurement and the proponent proposes self-naming as a benefactor (offering a construction discount materially above market naming rights value), this is permitted and encouraged, subject to the acceptable name criteria and Board approval.

Sub-facility naming opportunities (rinks, rooms, lobbies, gathering spaces) are retained by the RDCK and may be offered to community donors at any time, independent of the primary facility naming rights.

11 Signage and Design Standards

All naming rights signage must comply with the facility's design standards as established in the Owner's Statement of Requirements (OSR). Given the Commission's emphasis on wood integration and architectural quality, naming signage must be integrated into the building's design rather than applied as an afterthought.

Signage parameters (maximum dimensions, permitted locations, materials, lighting) will be defined in the OSR and shall form part of the Naming Rights Agreement. The cost of initial naming signage installation is the naming rights holder's responsibility unless otherwise agreed in the CCDC contract.

No animated, digital, or internally illuminated signage is permitted on the building exterior without specific Board approval.

12 RDCK Branding Integration

The facility's official name must coexist with the RDCK's corporate identity. All public communications, wayfinding signage, and official documents shall identify the facility as "[Facility Name] — A Castlegar & District Recreation Commission Facility" or equivalent language that identifies the RDCK's ownership and the Commission's operational oversight.

The naming rights holder's name or brand does not replace the RDCK's identity — it supplements it. The RDCK logo and branding shall appear on the facility in locations and at scales to be defined in the OSR.

13 Legal Framework

These guidelines are adopted by Board resolution and form the governance basis for the Naming Rights Agreement to be negotiated at Stage 9 of the procurement. The Naming Rights Agreement is a binding contract between the RDCK and the successful proponent (or their assignee) that incorporates these guidelines by reference.

Any conflict between the Naming Rights Agreement and these guidelines shall be resolved in favour of the guidelines, except where the guidelines have been specifically modified by Board resolution to accommodate the terms of the agreement.