



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

Date: Tuesday, July 7, 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:

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: 80871

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 July 7, 2026 Castlegar and District Recreation Commission meeting be adopted as circulated.

5. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

The June 2, 2026 Castlegar and District Recreation Commission minutes, have been received.

6 - 9

6. DELEGATE

There are no Delegates scheduled for this Commission meeting.

7. STAFF REPORTS

- | | | |
|------------|---|---------|
| 7.1 | Delegation Follow-up: Disc Golf at Pass Creek Regional Park
The Commission Report dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: Delegation Follow-up: Disc Golf at Pass Creek Regional Park has been received. | 10 - 11 |
| 7.2 | Delegation Follow-up: Cricket at Pass Creek Regional Park
The Commission report dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: Delegation Follow-up: Cricket at Pass Creek Regional Park has been received | 12 - 13 |
| 7.3 | Fees & Charges Correction – Representative Practices
The Commission Report dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: Delegation Follow-up: Fees & Charges Correction – Representative Practices has been received. | 14 - 15 |
| 7.4 | Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project – Timeline Update
The Commission report dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project – Timeline Update has been received. | 16 - 17 |

7.5	NRFP Shortlist & Honorarium Funding - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track	18 - 25
	The Commission Report, dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, re: NRFP Shortlist & Honorarium Funding - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track has been received	
	<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> That the Commission recommend that the Board approve inviting Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. to participate in the Stage 2 Negotiated Request for Proposals (NRFP) for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, and authorize staff to issue the NRFP to those proponents, subject to final administrative confirmation, confirmation of the additional funding, and execution of the required Participation Agreements; AND FURTHER, that the Commission recommend that the Board approve increasing the Stage 2 honorarium budget from \$100,000 to up to \$150,000, with the additional \$50,000 to be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms to be confirmed by those participants, with any honorarium payable only if the applicable proponent submits a compliant NRFP proposal and satisfies the honorarium requirements in the NRFP and Participation Agreement; AND FURTHER, that if the additional funding and required Participation Agreement confirmations cannot be completed in time to issue the NRFP without delaying the current project schedule, staff be authorized to proceed with the two highest-ranked Respondents, Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd.	
7.6	Community Engagement - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track The Commission report, dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services re: Community Engagement - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track, has been received.	26 - 31
7.7	Geotechnical Assessment Funding – Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project The Commission report, dated July 7, 2026 from Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services re: Geotechnical Assessment Funding – Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project has been received.	32 - 35
	<u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> That the Commission recommend that the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J provide funding from their respective financial resources to undertake the geotechnical assessment required to advance the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project and support the next phase of project development.	

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 August 4, 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 AGENDA

4:00 p.m.
June 2, 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).

Meeting Time:
4:00 p.m. PDT

COMMISSION/COMMITTEE MEMBERS

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

STAFF

Trisha Davison	General Manager of Community Services
Craig Stanley	Regional Manager of Operations and Asset Management
Kristi Calder	Regional Manager of Recreation & Client Services
Jenna Chapman	Meeting Coordinator

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bogle called the meeting to order at 4:06 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 June 2, 2026, Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting, be adopted as circulated.

Carried

4. RECEIPT OF MINUTES

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

5. DELEGATE

Ryan Niddery, Manager of Engineering and Infrastructure with the City of Castlegar presented an overview of the proposed Parks Master Plan (PMP), which will provide a long-term strategic framework to guide the development, maintenance, and investment in parks, trails, and recreation amenities throughout the city.

Freedom of the Floor

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

Key Discussion Points:

- The PMP builds upon the Parks Asset Management Plan initiated in 2022, which included asset inventories, condition assessments, lifecycle analysis, and funding reviews.
- The project supports objectives within the Official Community Plan related to enhancing amenities, reducing barriers to access, growing parks alongside community needs, and strengthening connectivity through parks and trail networks.
- Project work is anticipated to begin in 2026, with engagement activities occurring throughout the year.
- A draft Parks Master Plan is expected in 2027, followed by presentation to Council for consideration and adoption.
- While recognizing the importance of engaging with municipal partners, there has been consistent feedback from Area I (Davidoff) indicating that funding allocations are not being equitably directed toward their community.

6. STAFF REPORTS

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

Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services, provided the Commission with an update on the Arena and Walking Track Expansion Project as it progresses toward a referendum, highlighting key milestones and ongoing monthly reporting to the Commission including:

- The Request for Pre-Qualifications was issued May 29, 2026, with submissions closing June 26, 2026.
- General Voting Day for the referendum is scheduled for November 28, 2026, with official results expected by November 30, 2026.
- Staff are developing a public engagement strategy, including community meetings, pop-up events, digital communications, and advertising, with engagement anticipated from October to November 2026.

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

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 has been received.

Key Notable Items:

- Guidelines are now included in the RFPQ package released May 29, 2026

7. CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 Kootenay-Columbia Educational Heritage Society Letter

A letter from Mac Gregory, with the Kootenay-Columbia Educational Heritage Society has been received.

- Commissioner Davidoff volunteered his time to liaise with Mac Gregory and bring this back to the next Castlegar & District Recreation Commission in July.

MEMBER ABSENT:

Member Hanegraaf left the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

8. PUBLIC TIME

The Chair will call for questions from the public at 5:14 p.m.

9. NEXT MEETING

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

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED and seconded,
AND Resolved:

The Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting be adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Carried

Digitally Approved

B. Bogle, Chair

***If there are recommendations that need to go to the Board of Directors please add them to the list below and forward to Angela Lund, alund@rdck.bc.ca to be put on the Board agenda.**

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. *N/A*

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. Kootenay-Columbia Educational Heritage Society findings from member Davidoff.



Commission Report – For Information

July 7, 2026

Delegation Follow-up: Disc Golf at Pass Creek Regional Park

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 seek direction from Commission on the appropriate follow-up action to the Kootenay Rockies Disc Golf Society proposal to build a disc golf course at Pass Creek Regional Park.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND UPDATE

Background

The Kootenay Rockies Disc Golf Society (KRDGS) appeared before the Commission as a delegation to request support for the development of a disc golf course within Pass Creek Regional Park.

Earlier this year, the Commission directed staff to meet with representatives of the KRDGS on-site to review the proposed concept and site plan. Following that review, the original proposal has been revised from an 18-hole course to a 9-hole course. The updated concept has since been presented to the Commission for consideration.

Considerations

To advance the project, staff require direction from the Commission regarding the following:

- Whether the development of a disc golf course at Pass Creek Regional Park is considered a priority project for the Commission.
- If deemed a priority, authorization for staff to develop and bring forward a project plan outlining:
 - Required pre-development work and associated costs;
 - Review of applicable park management objectives and policies;
 - Assessment of environmental and biological considerations;
 - Evaluation of potential danger tree and safety concerns; and
 - Overall feasibility of the proposed site plan.

The results of this work would provide the Commission with the information necessary to determine whether the project should proceed.

Project Prioritization

Should the Commission choose to advance this initiative, consideration may need to be given to the potential reprioritization of existing projects and work plan commitments. This consideration would be brought forward as part of a staff report at a future meeting.

Commission Options

1. Receive the report for information and take no further action.
2. Identify the disc golf course project as a Commission priority and direct staff to develop a project plan and feasibility assessment for future consideration.

3.0 NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

The next steps will be dependent on the direction provided to staff from Commission.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

Regional Manager, Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley 

Regional Manager, Recreation & Client Services – Kristi Calder 



Commission Report – For Information

July 7, 2026

Delegation Follow-up: Cricket at Pass Creek Regional Park

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 seek direction from Commission on the appropriate follow-up action to the Castlegar Super Kings proposal to build a cricket pitch at Pass Creek Regional Park.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND UPDATE

Background

The Castlegar Super Kings appeared before the Commission in December 2025 as a delegation to request support for the development of a cricket pitch within Pass Creek Regional Park. Staff met with the group at the park in early 2026 to review the site plan.

In follow-up to the delegation and request from the Castlegar Super Kings, staff are seeking direction from the Commission on any future actions regarding approvals and development of the project.

Considerations

To advance the project, staff require direction from the Commission regarding the following:

- Whether the development of a cricket pitch at Pass Creek Regional Park is considered a priority project for the Commission.
- If deemed a priority, authorization for staff to develop and bring forward a project plan at a future meeting outlining:
 - Review of site considerations
 - Required pre-development work and associated costs;
 - Impact or conflict with other park user groups or proposed park projects;
 - Overall feasibility of the proposed site plan.

The results of this work would provide the Commission with the information necessary to determine whether the project should proceed.

Project Prioritization

Should the Commission choose to advance this initiative, consideration may need to be given to the potential reprioritization of existing projects and work plan commitments. This consideration would be brought forward as part of a staff report at a future meeting.

Commission Options

1. Receive the report for information and take no further action at this time.
2. Identify the cricket pitch project as a Commission priority and direct staff to develop a project plan and feasibility assessment for future consideration.

3.0 NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

The next steps will be dependent on the direction provided to staff from Commission.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

Regional Manager, Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley

Regional Manager, Recreation & Client Services – Kristi Calder





Commission Report – For Information

July 7, 2026

Fees & Charges Correction – Representative Practices (CDRD)

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

The purpose of this report is to advise the Commission of an error discovered in the 2026/2027 Fees & Charges schedule for “Representative Practices” for the Castlegar & Area Complex Arena.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND UPDATE

In May 2026, the Board approved the recommendation from the All Recreation Committee to approve the 2026/2027 Fees & Charges schedule for all fees related to general admission, term-based memberships and rental rates.

As staff began to implement the fees in preparation for the development of ice contracts for the upcoming ice season, an error was noticed in the fee identified for “Representative Practices” at the Castlegar & District Recreation Complex (CDRD) arena. The rate for this fee category, in all major RDCK recreation complexes, is to be aligned with the “Youth Recreation Prime” rate. In the fee schedule approved by the Board, this align exists for Nelson & District Community Complex and the Creston & District Community Complex but does not for the CDRD.

The correction would be as follows:

Fee Category	2025/2026	2026/2027	Correction – 2026/2027
Youth Recreation Prime	\$110.11	\$121.12	\$121.12
Representative Practices	\$110.11	\$112.56	\$121.12

The 2026/2027 fee schedule has not yet been posted publicly as it doesn’t come into effect until September 2026. The impact of this change is expected to be minimal and is philosophically in alignment with how fees have been charged historically for this fee category.

3.0 NEXT STEPS AND TIMELINE

The next steps include:

Step	Timeline
Finalize Facility Use Contracts for User Groups	In progress
Update Fee Schedule online	August 2026
Note correction in fee calculations for 2027	Complete

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






Commission Report – For Information

July 7, 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

This report is in follow-up to the report provided to Commission on the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track project at their June 2, 2026 meeting.

Timeline Update - Key Milestones

Topic	Status
RFPQ Issued on May 29	Complete
Service Establishment Bylaw and Loan Authorization Bylaw – 1 st & 2 nd Readings at June 18 Board Meeting	Complete
RFPQ Closed – June 26	Complete
Report to Commission for July 7 meeting – RFPQ Results	In Progress
Recommendation to the Board re: RFPQ Proponet Award – July 16 Board Meeting	Pending
Bylaws & supporting documentation submitted to Inspector for review – July 23	Pending
Assent Vote material and required resolution drafted – August	Pending
Statutory Approval anticipated by September 18	Pending
Assent Vote resolution and ballot question provided to the Board for approval – Sept 24	Pending
Public notice specific to referendum logistics – October	Pending
Public Engagement – October 7 to November 27	Pending
General Voting Day – November 28	Pending
Results declared – November 30	Pending

Project Timeline Risks

There continue to be a number of key milestones that could impact meeting the target referendum date of November 28, 2026. Several reports presented to Commission at this meeting are highlighting a number of complexities staff are working to navigate to keep the project on track.

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 



Commission Report

July 7, 2026

NRFP Shortlist & Honorarium Funding - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track

Author: Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services
File Reference: 01-0520-50, PRJ25033-R1
Electoral Area/Municipality: City of Castlegar & Electoral Area J
Services Impacted: Service number not yet established

1.0 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve inviting Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. to participate in the Stage 2 Negotiated Request for Proposals (NRFP) for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, and authorize staff to issue the NRFP to those proponents, subject to final administrative confirmation, confirmation of the additional funding, and execution of the required Participation Agreements;

AND FURTHER, that the Commission recommend that the Board approve increasing the Stage 2 honorarium budget from \$100,000 to up to \$150,000, with the additional \$50,000 to be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms to be confirmed by those participants, with any honorarium payable only if the applicable proponent submits a compliant NRFP proposal and satisfies the honorarium requirements in the NRFP and Participation Agreement;

AND FURTHER, that if the additional funding and required Participation Agreement confirmations cannot be completed in time to issue the NRFP without delaying the current project schedule, staff be authorized to proceed with the two highest-ranked Respondents, Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd.

2.0 BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The RDCK is advancing a two-stage procurement process for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project. The first stage was a Request for Pre-Qualification (RFPQ) to identify qualified design-build firms for the second stage, a Negotiated Request for Proposal (NRFP). The Stage 2 NRFP will require shortlisted proponents to develop detailed design-build proposals, project approaches, and pricing within the defined project budget and based on the Owner's Statement of Requirements.

The RFPQ was a qualifications stage. It assessed respondent experience, team capability, technical understanding, and capacity to participate in a later design-build competition. It did not require respondents to submit fixed prices, detailed designs, complete scope solutions, or binding commitments that the full OSR can be delivered for the \$15,000,000 hard cap.

As a result, the fact that the RDCK received four compliant RFPQ submissions should not be interpreted as market confirmation that the \$15,000,000 project budget is achievable. The stronger-than-expected response is positive because it shows interest in participating in the process, but the budget achievability test will occur at the Stage 2 NRFP stage.

The project team established the Stage 2 procurement strategy and associated honorarium budget based on industry feedback and advice from HCMA as Owner's Representative, which indicated that attracting two highly qualified proponents would represent a successful outcome. On that basis, the budget included two honoraria of \$50,000 each, for a total honorarium budget of \$100,000, and the RFPQ stated an intention to shortlist up to two Respondents. The procurement process generated stronger-than-anticipated market interest, resulting in a larger pool of qualified proponents for consideration.

The RDCK received four compliant submissions. The number of submissions was higher than anticipated and provides an opportunity to strengthen the Stage 2 process. Following the staff evaluation, the Respondents were ranked as follows: 1) Scott Builders Inc.; 2) Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd.; 3) Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc.; and 4) Krawford Construction Company Inc.

While the top two Respondents achieved the highest overall rankings, Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. was ranked third and was determined to be qualified through the evaluation process. Given the objective of maximizing competition and improving the resilience of the Stage 2 procurement process, staff, with the support of HCMA as Owner's Representative, recommend advancing the three highest-ranked proponents to Stage 2. This approach is consistent with the RFPQ, which reserved the RDCK's discretion to qualify more or fewer than two Respondents for the next stage of the procurement process.

Staff have also received cautionary market feedback from an experienced arena contractor that reviewed the RFPQ and concept material but chose not to participate. That contractor advised that, based on its quick review and recent ice-rink construction experience, it was concerned that the \$15,000,000 upset budget was not sufficient for the proposed program. This feedback is not determinative and reflects a preliminary market view, but it reinforces the need to treat the Stage 2 NRFP as a real market test rather than as a formality.

The issue for the Commission is therefore not whether to change the evaluation ranking or reopen the RFPQ. Rather, the issue is whether the RDCK should use the flexibility built into the RFPQ to invite the top three Respondents to the Stage 2 NRFP in order to improve procurement resilience and protect the current project schedule.

3.0 PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

Staff must now confirm whether the Stage 2 NRFP should proceed with two proponents, as originally budgeted, or with three proponents, which would require an additional \$50,000 in potential honorarium funding. The opportunity is to reduce the risk that the RDCK receives only one or no compliant Stage 2 proposals and to improve the likelihood that the Commission and Board have more than one competitive design-build proposal to consider.

If only two proponents are invited to Stage 2, the project becomes more exposed to proponent withdrawal, capacity constraints, pricing concerns, or failure to submit a compliant proposal. If one of two proponents withdraws or does not submit a compliant proposal, the RDCK may be left with a single proposal. A single proposal would reduce negotiating leverage, weaken value-for-money testing, and provide less ability to compare design, schedule, risk allocation, and price.

If no compliant proposals are received, the RDCK may need to return to one or both excluded Respondents or restart a portion of the procurement process. That could set the project back by several months or more. In the context of the proposed service establishment and borrowing bylaws, public engagement, referendum timing,

and the 80-day window following Inspector of Municipalities approval, a significant procurement delay could jeopardize the current schedule and may require resubmitting or re-timing the bylaws.

Proceeding with three proponents does not guarantee a better outcome, but it materially improves the probability that the RDCK will receive multiple compliant proposals and maintain competitive pressure through the Stage 2 process.

3.1 Alignment to Board Strategic Plan

Proceeding with three proponents supports organizational excellence, responsible financial stewardship, and public accountability by improving the likelihood that the RDCK receives multiple compliant proposals before making a major capital commitment. It also supports the broader objective of maintaining public confidence in a fair, competitive, and transparent procurement process for a significant community facility.

3.2 Legislative and Procurement Considerations

The procurement process must continue to be administered in accordance with RDCK procurement policies and applicable trade agreement obligations. The RFPQ anticipated a two-stage procurement process and stated an intent to shortlist up to two Respondents, but it also preserved discretion for the RDCK to include more or fewer Respondents. Expanding the Stage 2 shortlist to the top three Respondents is therefore consistent with the procurement framework disclosed in the RFPQ, provided the decision is made transparently, before Stage 2 is issued, and for rational procurement reasons.

No Stage 1 ranking or score would carry forward into Stage 2. All three Qualified Respondents would receive the same NRFP documents, the same opportunity to participate, and the same Participation Agreement and honorarium conditions. The Stage 2 evaluation would remain focused on the quality, compliance, price, value, and risk profile of the Stage 2 proposals.

The existing 2026 Financial Plan for Service S222 includes \$100,000 for two potential Stage 2 honoraria. The additional \$50,000 required for a third potential honorarium should not be committed until the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J confirm their funding mechanisms and any required budget authority or Financial Plan amendment is addressed.

3.3 What Are the Risks

The key project risk is that the Stage 2 market test may not produce a compliant proposal that delivers the required OSR within the hard-capped \$15,000,000 budget. The key procurement risk of proceeding with only two proponents is that the RDCK may receive only one or no compliant proposals. This would reduce negotiating leverage and could require a significant process reset.

The key risk of proceeding with three proponents is the additional potential honorarium cost of \$50,000, along with modest additional staff and consultant time to manage questions, meetings, proposal review, and evaluation.

The additional cost risk is limited because the third honorarium would only be payable if three proponents submit compliant NRFP proposals and satisfy the applicable honorarium requirements. The additional administrative burden is expected to be manageable within the current project team and with the support of HCMA as Owner's Representative.

4.0 PROPOSED SOLUTION

Staff recommend proceeding to Stage 2 with three Qualified Respondents: Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. This approach requires increasing the potential Stage 2 honorarium budget by \$50,000, from \$100,000 to up to \$150,000, with the additional amount to be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms to be confirmed.

The purpose of adding the third proponent is not to assume that the project can be delivered for \$15,000,000. The purpose is to improve the reliability of the market test by increasing the number of qualified teams that will be asked to submit actual design-build solutions, price proposals, and compliance commitments against the OSR and the hard-capped budget.

Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. is recommended as the third proponent because it was the third-ranked Respondent and was considered a highly qualified proponent through the evaluation process. Advancing Kalesnikoff to Stage 2 recognizes the strength of the top three submissions and provides an opportunity to test a distinct local and delivery approach against the project's budget and performance requirements. Inviting Kalesnikoff therefore adds meaningful resilience and diversity to the Stage 2 market test without departing from the evaluation ranking.

Staff do not recommend inviting Krawford Construction Company Inc. as a fourth proponent. Krawford submitted a compliant response and should not be viewed as incapable or unsuitable generally. However, the response was ranked fourth through the RFPQ evaluation. Moving from three to four proponents would require up to another \$50,000 in potential honorarium funding, increasing the additional exposure from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and would add further administrative and evaluation effort. In staff's view, the incremental benefit of adding a fourth proponent is not proportionate to the additional cost and effort at this stage.

Proceeding with three proponents gives the project the best chance of receiving more than one compliant proposal, preserving competitive tension, and maintaining the current tight schedule. It also provides a more resilient procurement path in the event that one proponent withdraws, elects not to submit, or submits a non-compliant proposal after reviewing the full NRFP and Owner's Statement of Requirements.

To avoid delay, the approval should include a fallback: if the additional funding and participation agreement confirmations cannot be completed in time to issue the NRFP without delaying the current project schedule, staff should proceed with the two highest-ranked Respondents, Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd.

4.1 Financial Considerations of the Proposed Solution

The existing Stage 2 honorarium budget is \$100,000, based on two \$50,000 honoraria. The recommended approach would increase the potential honorarium budget to up to \$150,000, requiring an additional \$50,000 in potential funding. The additional amount would be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, conditional on those participants confirming their funding mechanisms.

The additional \$50,000 would not necessarily be spent. It would only become payable if all three proponents submit a compliant NRFP proposal and satisfy the requirements of the NRFP and Participation Agreement, including any intellectual property, validity, and other honorarium conditions. If any of the proponents withdraw or do not submit a compliant proposal, the honorarium to that proponent would not be payable.

If a Financial Plan amendment or other budget authority is required to reflect the additional funding and potential expenditure, it should be completed before the expenditure is committed. If the proposed service is established, the treatment of any recovery or reimbursement of the additional procurement cost should be addressed in the related funding arrangements for the project.

4.2 Risks with the Proposed Solution

The recommended approach increases the potential Stage 2 honorarium cost by \$50,000 and will require modest additional staff and consultant time to manage the Stage 2 process. There is also no guarantee that all three proponents will submit compliant proposals or that the third proposal will materially improve the final project outcome.

These risks are considered manageable and proportionate to the schedule and procurement risks they help mitigate. The additional \$50,000 is small relative to the scale of the proposed capital project and provides practical risk mitigation against the more serious consequences of a single-proposal or no-proposal outcome.

There is also a risk that seeking additional funding could itself delay the process. This risk is addressed by the recommended fallback authorization to proceed with the top two Respondents if the funding and participation agreement confirmations cannot be completed in time to maintain the NRFP schedule.

4.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

Proceeding with three proponents will increase the work required to manage proponent communications, respond to questions, review submissions, and support evaluation. The incremental workload is expected to be manageable within the project team and with HCMA's support as Owner's Representative. This incremental workload is preferable to the larger workplan disruption that could occur if the RDCK receives only one or no compliant proposals and must attempt to recover the procurement schedule later.

4.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

A three-proponent Stage 2 process increases the likelihood that the RDCK can present a well-tested, value-informed project path to the public and the Board. It supports confidence that the preferred proposal has been selected through a competitive process with sufficient market participation, rather than through a process that became non-competitive because of withdrawal or non-compliance.

The decision does not change the planned public engagement process. However, receiving multiple compliant proposals may provide better information about design options, scope trade-offs, schedule, and value-for-money considerations that can inform subsequent Commission, Board, and public discussions.

4.5 Leveraging Technology

N/A

4.6 Measuring Success

Success will be measured by timely confirmation of the additional funding, execution of Participation Agreements with the invited proponents, issuance of the NRFP without delaying the current schedule, receipt of multiple compliant Stage 2 proposals, and selection of a preferred proponent that offers strong value and a deliverable project path.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION(S)

The alternative solution is to proceed to Stage 2 with only the top two Respondents, Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., using the existing \$100,000 Stage 2 honorarium budget.

5.1 Financial Considerations of the Alternative Solution(s)

The alternative would avoid the need for the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J to identify an additional \$50,000 at this time. The maximum potential honorarium budget would remain \$100,000, subject to the NRFP and Participation Agreement conditions. No additional honorarium funding would be required unless the Commission and Board later chose to change course.

5.2 Risks with the Alternative Solution(s)

The alternative carries a higher procurement and schedule risk. If one of the two proponents withdraws or cannot submit a compliant proposal, the RDCK may be left with only one proposal, reducing negotiating leverage and the ability to assess comparative value. If neither proponent submits a compliant proposal, the RDCK may need to return to one or both excluded Respondents or restart part of the process.

Given the compressed schedule, this delay could affect downstream timing for public engagement, referendum readiness, Board approvals, and the 80-day window following Inspector of Municipalities approval. This could jeopardize the current schedule and may require resubmitting or re-timing the service establishment and borrowing bylaws.

5.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

Proceeding with two proponents would reduce the immediate Stage 2 evaluation workload. However, that smaller workload should be weighed against the substantially greater workplan impact that could arise if the two-proponent process does not produce enough compliant proposals to support a timely and competitive selection decision.

5.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

The two-proponent approach would still maintain a competitive process if both proponents submit compliant proposals. It would also align with the original budget and avoid the appearance of increasing procurement costs. However, it provides less resilience and fewer design-build options for the Commission, Board, and public to consider if one proponent withdraws or fails to submit a compliant proposal.

5.5 Measuring Success

Success under the alternative would require both invited proponents to remain in the process and submit compliant Stage 2 proposals by the NRFP closing date. If only one compliant proposal is received, the process may still be able to continue, but with reduced competitive tension and less comparative information for decision-making.

6.0 OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT NOT PRESENTED

Shortlisting all four Respondents was considered but is not presented as a recommended option. Although it would provide the largest proponent pool, it would require up to \$100,000 in additional honorarium funding and would include the fourth-ranked Respondent. Staff do not consider the incremental benefit of moving from three to four proponents to be proportionate to the additional cost and workload. Further, the Evaluation Committee's scoring resulted in a clear ranking of proponents. The response ranked fourth was consistently ranked fourth by all evaluators and is therefore not recommended to advance to Stage 2.

Cancelling or restarting the RFPQ process is also not presented. Four compliant Responses were received and evaluated, and the RFPQ preserved the discretion required to proceed with three Respondents without restarting the process.

7.0 OPTIONS SUMMARY

Option 1 (Recommended): Proceed to Stage 2 with three Qualified Respondents - Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. - conditional on confirmation of up to \$50,000 in additional honorarium funding from the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J.

Recommendation:

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve inviting Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. to participate in the Stage 2 NRFP for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, and approve increasing the Stage 2 honorarium budget from \$100,000 to up to \$150,000, with the additional \$50,000 funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms to be confirmed by those participants, with the third honorarium payable only if the third proponent submits a compliant NRFP proposal and satisfies the applicable honorarium requirements.

Option 2: Proceed to Stage 2 with two Qualified Respondents - Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd. - using the existing \$100,000 honorarium budget.

Recommendation:

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve inviting only Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd. to participate in the Stage 2 NRFP for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, recognizing that this approach remains within the existing honorarium budget but carries greater risk of a single-proposal or no-proposal outcome.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve inviting Scott Builders Inc., Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd., and Kalesnikoff Mass Timber Inc. to participate in the Stage 2 Negotiated Request for Proposals (NRFP) for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, and authorize staff to issue the NRFP to those proponents, subject to final administrative confirmation, confirmation of the additional funding, and execution of the required Participation Agreements;

AND FURTHER, that the Commission recommend that the Board approve increasing the Stage 2 honorarium budget from \$100,000 to up to \$150,000, with the additional \$50,000 to be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms to be confirmed by those participants, with any honorarium payable only if the applicable proponent submits a compliant NRFP proposal and satisfies the honorarium requirements in the NRFP and Participation Agreement;

AND FURTHER, that if the additional funding and required Participation Agreement confirmations cannot be completed in time to issue the NRFP without delaying the current project schedule, staff be authorized to proceed with the two highest-ranked Respondents, Scott Builders Inc. and Smith Bros. & Wilson (Construction) Ltd.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

General Manager, IT, Procurement, & Finance – Yev Malloff – Digitally Approved

Regional Manager of Operations & Asset Management - Craig Stanley 

Senior Project Manager - AJ Evenson 



Commission Report

July 7, 2026

Community Engagement - Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track

Author: Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services
File Reference: 01-0520-50
Electoral Area/Municipality: ELECTORAL AREA J, CITY OF CASTLEGAR
Services Impacted: Service number not yet established

1.0 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve a fulsome public engagement program of up to \$45,000 for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, funded through the reallocation of \$12,000 from the existing advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex – Castlegar and Areas I & J), \$15,000 from Service S100 – General Administration from anticipated 2026 surplus, and the remaining \$18,000 from the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, conditional on those participants confirming their funding mechanisms, with the professional services agreement to be awarded to HCMA Architecture + Design under the Non-Competitive Purchase Method and delegated purchasing authority in RDCK Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12;

AND FURTHER, that if the proposed service is established, the new service repay the \$12,000 and \$15,000 contributions carried by Services S222 and S100 in accordance with section 379(4) of the Local Government Act.

2.0 BACKGROUND/HISTORY

As part of advancing the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track project, staff have been developing a community engagement plan in the event the project proceeds to a referendum. Through this work, it was identified that dedicated public engagement support is required, as internal capacity is not sufficient to deliver the level of engagement considered necessary ahead of a referendum.

Given the compressed project timeline, a competitive RFP process could not be completed without risking delays to the overall schedule. As a result, staff requested that HCMA submit a proposal to support the community engagement process, given their existing role on the project, their familiarity with the file, and their ability to mobilize quickly. HCMA understands that the project may not advance to a referendum, in which case this portion of the work would not proceed.

The proposal submitted by HCMA totals \$64,225 and is based on the scope of work and engagement objectives provided by staff during a preliminary conversation. Staff have since scoped two program levels, both delivered by HCMA: a minimum program of \$30,000, which staff assess as the minimum acceptable public engagement cost for a project of this scope and size, and a fulsome program of \$45,000. The reduction from HCMA's original proposal already reflects staff taking on an increased portion of the work internally, and there is no remaining internal capacity to reduce the cost further. Both program levels are presented in this report.

3.0 PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

Staff have identified three issues that need to be resolved before public engagement work for this project can proceed:

- **Cost:** HCMA's proposed fee of \$64,225 exceeds what staff consider reasonable. Staff have identified two viable program levels: a minimum program at \$30,000, the minimum acceptable cost for a project of this scope and size, and a fulsome program at \$45,000. Both levels already assume staff take on an increased portion of the work; there is no internal capacity to reduce the cost further.
- **Procurement authority:** The compressed timeline does not allow for a competitive RFP process, so either program level would involve a direct (sole-source) award to HCMA. Under Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12, the Non-Competitive Purchase Method may be approved by the applicable Senior Manager or the CAO, and a Board resolution is required only where a Non-Competitive Purchase exceeds \$75,000; an award at either program level is therefore within the delegated authority of the General Manager of Community Services.
- **Funding:** This work is not included in the 2026 Financial Plan. Staff propose that \$12,000 be reallocated from the existing \$30,000 advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex) and that \$15,000 be funded from Service S100 – General Administration from anticipated 2026 surplus, consistent with the RDCK's usual approach of funding engagement for assent voting through S100 with recovery from the new service if established. Under the fulsome program, the remaining \$18,000 would be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, subject to those participants confirming their funding mechanisms.

3.1 Alignment to Board Strategic Plan

Delivering a referendum requires a significant investment of staff time and resources. Ensuring these efforts are supported by a comprehensive public engagement strategy will help provide the community with the information necessary to make an informed decision on a major capital project, while supporting the organization's strategic objective of organizational excellence.

3.2 Legislative Considerations

The RDCK Purchasing Policy (No. 300-06-12) provides that competition is the default for third-party services, but permits a Non-Competitive Purchase to be approved by the applicable Senior Manager or the CAO where, among other circumstances, only one supplier is able to meet the requirements of the procurement.

For the recommended fulsome program, HCMA's role as Owner's Advisor, its detailed knowledge of the project, and the compressed timeline to the proposed assent vote mean that no other supplier could deliver this scope within the available window. At either program level, the award is within delegated purchasing authority under Table 1.0 of the Policy and below the \$75,000 threshold at which a Board resolution for a Non-Competitive Purchase and trade agreement review would be required, and the agreement will be capped accordingly.

The Local Government Act (s. 401) requires expenditures to be provided for in the Financial Plan before they are made. The \$12,000 S222 reallocation and the \$15,000 S100 share can be accommodated within those services' approved appropriations, and a Financial Plan amendment bylaw will be brought forward if monitoring indicates it is required.

Under section 379(4) of the Local Government Act, if the proposed service is established, engagement costs carried by Services S222 and S100 are deemed costs of the new service and will be recovered from it. Because this engagement relates to an assent vote, all materials will provide factual, balanced information and will not promote a particular outcome, consistent with the Local Elections Campaign Financing Act and provincial assent voting guidance.

3.3 What Are the Risks

Without timely approval of the award and the funding, staff risk losing the lead time needed to develop engagement materials and mobilize ahead of the proposed referendum date, putting the engagement timeline and the referendum schedule at risk.

4.0 PROPOSED SOLUTION

Staff recommend proceeding with the fulsome public engagement program, with a budget of up to \$45,000, delivered by HCMA, to provide residents with factual information in support of the proposed Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track referendum. Staff propose that \$12,000 be reallocated from the existing advertising budget in Service S222, that \$15,000 be funded from Service S100 – General Administration, and that the remaining \$18,000 be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, conditional on those participants confirming their funding mechanisms. The minimum program is presented as Option 2, but may not provide the same reach and level of engagement as the recommended program.

HCMA's existing knowledge of the project, gained through its role as Owner's Advisor, positions the firm to mobilize quickly and deliver the program within the compressed timeline, without the ramp-up period a new consultant would require. Once funding is confirmed, the professional services agreement will be awarded under the Non-Competitive Purchase Method and delegated purchasing authority in Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12, capped at \$45,000.

HCMA has been advised that the project's advancement to referendum is not yet confirmed and that their engagement services are not guaranteed; should the project not proceed to referendum, the scope of work and the associated award would be adjusted or discontinued accordingly.

4.1 Financial Considerations of the Proposed Solution

The 2026 Financial Plan does not include this expenditure. The RDCK's usual approach to public engagement for assent voting referendums has been to fund the engagement component from Service S100 – General Administration, with the costs recovered from the new service if it is established.

Staff propose a blended approach: \$12,000 reallocated from the existing \$30,000 advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex – Castlegar and Areas I & J), which requires no new taxation and reflects the direct relationship between the proposed facility and the Complex, and \$15,000 funded from S100 from anticipated 2026 surplus. Both amounts can be accommodated within the services' approved appropriations.

If monitoring indicates otherwise, staff will bring forward a Financial Plan amendment bylaw before the expenditure is made, as required by section 401 of the Local Government Act. Under the fulsome program, the remaining \$18,000 would be funded by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through funding mechanisms they identify and confirm. Once confirmed, the contributions and the corresponding expenditure will be reflected in a Financial Plan amendment.

Consistent with section 379(4) of the Local Government Act, if the proposed service is established, the new service will repay the \$12,000 and \$15,000 contributions carried by Services S222 and S100 as costs of establishing the service; if the service is not established, those costs will remain with the contributing services. Any repayment of the participants' contributions on establishment of the service would be addressed in the related funding arrangements.

4.2 Risks with the Proposed Solution

The recommended program is conditional on the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J confirming funding for \$18,000. Delay in confirming funding would erode the lead time needed to mobilize HCMA and could put the engagement schedule and the assent vote timeline at risk.

Some components will still be delivered internally by the Community Services Communications and Community Engagement Lead, which may require the reprioritization of other items within the position's work plan over the next four to six months.

In addition, should unforeseen circumstances prevent this staff member from carrying out these responsibilities, the associated work would need to be contracted out, resulting in additional project costs. Because HCMA also serves as the project's Owner's Advisor, RDCK staff will retain editorial control and review all engagement materials to ensure content remains factual and neutral with respect to the outcome of the assent vote.

4.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

Both program levels assume the Communications and Community Engagement Lead takes on an increased portion of the work, as reflected in the reduction of HCMA's original proposal from \$64,225 to \$45,000. There is no remaining internal capacity to take on additional work to reduce the cost below \$30,000.

4.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

The Local Government Act prescribes formal public notice requirements for assent voting but does not mandate a broader community engagement program. The scope of engagement is at the RDCK's discretion. Provincial best-practice guidance is that residents should receive objective, balanced information sufficient to make an informed decision and to know when and how to vote. A robust engagement program supports an informed result and mitigates the consequence that, if the bylaws do not receive assent, they cannot be resubmitted to the electors for six months without the approval of the Minister.

4.5 Leveraging Technology

N/A

4.6 Measuring Success

N/A

5.0 ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION(S)

The alternative solution is the minimum public engagement program at \$30,000, delivered by HCMA (see Option 2). Staff assess \$30,000 as the minimum acceptable public engagement cost for a project of this scope and size. This approach may not provide the same reach and level of engagement as the recommended program.

5.1 Financial Considerations of the Alternative Solution(s)

The minimum program would be fully funded through the \$12,000 reallocation from Service S222 and \$18,000 from Service S100, with the same repayment by the new service if it is established. No funding from the City of Castlegar or Electoral Area J would be required.

5.2 Risks with the Alternative Solution(s)

A minimum program may not provide the same reach and level of engagement as the recommended program and carries the risk that some residents will feel insufficiently informed or consulted on a major capital decision, which can affect both the assent vote result and its perceived legitimacy.

5.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

The workplan impact is comparable under either program level. The Communications and Community Engagement Lead has already committed to an increased portion of the work, and no further internal capacity is available.

5.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

The minimum program would provide residents with the essential factual information needed ahead of the assent vote, but with fewer engagement opportunities and narrower reach than the recommended program.

5.5 Measuring Success

Not applicable

6.0 OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT NOT PRESENTED

A competitive procurement process for the engagement services was considered but is not presented, as it could not be completed within the time available ahead of the proposed assent vote.

7.0 OPTIONS SUMMARY

Option 1 (Recommended): Fulsome public engagement program – \$45,000, delivered by HCMA Architecture + Design, funded by a \$12,000 reallocation from Service S222, \$18,000 from Service S100, and \$15,000 from the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J.

Recommendation:

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve a fulsome public engagement program of up to \$45,000 for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, funded through the reallocation of \$12,000 from the existing advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex – Castlegar and Areas I & J), \$18,000 from Service S100 – General Administration from anticipated 2026 surplus, and the remaining \$15,000 from the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, conditional on those participants confirming their funding mechanisms, with the professional services agreement to be awarded to HCMA Architecture + Design under the Non-Competitive Purchase Method and delegated purchasing authority in RDCK Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12;

AND FURTHER, that if the proposed service is established, the new service repay the \$12,000 and \$18,000 contributions carried by Services S222 and S100 in accordance with section 379(4) of the Local Government Act.

Option 2: Minimum public engagement program – \$30,000, delivered by HCMA Architecture + Design, funded by a \$12,000 reallocation from Service S222 and \$18,000 from Service S100.

Recommendation:

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve a minimum public engagement program of \$30,000 for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, funded through the reallocation of \$12,000 from the existing advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex) and \$18,000 from Service S100 – General Administration from anticipated 2026 surplus, recognizing that this approach may not provide the same reach and level of engagement as the fulsome program, with the professional services agreement to be awarded to HCMA Architecture + Design under the Non-Competitive Purchase Method and delegated purchasing authority in RDCK Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12; AND FURTHER, that if the proposed service is established, the new service repay the \$12,000 and \$18,000 contributions carried by Services S222 and S100 in accordance with section 379(4) of the Local Government Act.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the Board approve a fulsome public engagement program of up to \$45,000 for the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project, funded through the reallocation of \$12,000 from the existing advertising budget in Service S222 (Castlegar & District Community Complex – Castlegar and Areas I & J), \$15,000 from Service S100 – General Administration from anticipated 2026 surplus, and the remaining \$18,000 from the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J, conditional on those participants confirming their funding mechanisms, with the professional services agreement to be awarded to HCMA Architecture + Design under the Non-Competitive Purchase Method and delegated purchasing authority in RDCK Purchasing Policy No. 300-06-12;

AND FURTHER, that if the proposed service is established, the new service repay the \$12,000 and \$15,000 contributions carried by Services S222 and S100 in accordance with section 379(4) of the Local Government Act.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

General Manager – IT, Procurement & Finance – Yev Malloff - Digitally Approved

Regional Manager, Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley 

Regional Manager, Recreation & Client Services – Kristi Calder 

Communications & Community Engagement Lead – Sarah Fuhr – Digitally Approved



Commission Report

July 7, 2026

Geotechnical Assessment Funding – Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project

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

1.0 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J provide funding from their respective financial resources to undertake the geotechnical assessment required to advance the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project and support the next phase of project development.

2.0 BACKGROUND/HISTORY

At the May 25, 2026 Castlegar & District Recreation Commission meeting the following resolution was passed:

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.

The Draft Financial Plan presented outlined the flow of funds for the Project and the new service (if approved through voter assent). Within that Financial Plan the geotechnical assessment and environmental testing was identified at a cost of \$90,000.

3.0 PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

As planning for the project has progressed, it has been determined that the geotechnical assessment must be completed prior to proponents responding to the RFP deadline. The information obtained through this work will be required by proponents to develop informed and responsive design proposals. This represents a change from the original assumption that the geotechnical work would be undertaken following a successful referendum and the establishment of a new service.

As a result, funding for this work is now required earlier in the project timeline and has not been incorporated into any existing budget. A funding source will need to be identified to allow the assessment to proceed and support the continued advancement of the project.

Further, any delay in securing funding could impact the overall project schedule, including the timely procurement and coordination of the geotechnical consultant, potentially affecting other interdependent project milestones and activities.

3.1 Alignment to Board Strategic Plan

The proposed solution supports Organizational Excellence by ensuring key technical information is obtained early in the project planning process, allowing for informed decision-making, effective risk management, and responsible stewardship of public resources. Completing the geotechnical assessment at this stage will help support efficient project delivery and reduce the potential for delays or unforeseen costs in future phases of the project.

3.2 Legislative Considerations

Financial Plan Authority

Under the *Local Government Act*, regional districts must adopt a financial plan that identifies expenditures and funding sources for each service. As funding for the geotechnical assessment was not anticipated at the time and there is no service currently established for the project the geotechnical assessment is directly servicing, it is recommended that the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J identify an appropriate funding source within their resources to support this work.

Procurement

At the time of writing this report, the specific procurement requirements necessary to support the project schedule have not yet been fully determined. Depending on the scope, timing, and availability of qualified service providers, procurement options may include a recommendation to sole-source certain work or to obtain competitive quotations. As project requirements become clearer, staff will assess the circumstances and proceed with the procurement approach that best aligns with applicable policies, timelines, and project objectives.

3.3 What Are the Risks

Should funding not be identified in a timely manner, there is a risk that the geotechnical assessment cannot be completed within the timeframe required to support the RFP process. Delays to the assessment may impact subsequent project milestones and could affect the overall project schedule, including timelines associated with procurement, design development, public engagement activities, and any future referendum process.

4.0 PROPOSED SOLUTION

As the geotechnical assessment is considered a project cost directly associated with the project proceeding, it is recommended that the City of Castlegar and Area J fund the costs of this work from their financial resources.

4.1 Financial Considerations of the Proposed Solution

Staff are continuing to refine the cost estimate for the geotechnical assessment; however, preliminary estimates indicate that approximately \$50,000 will be required to complete the work. As there is currently no established service or approved budget associated with the proposed project, there is no existing funding source from which these costs can be allocated.

Given that the geotechnical assessment is a project-specific cost associated with advancing the Arena and Walking Track Project, it is recommended that funding be provided directly by the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J through their respective financial resources. This approach avoids utilizing funds from Service S222, which

includes contributions from Electoral Area I taxpayers who would not participate in the proposed service or be responsible for the future capital costs of the project should it proceed.

It is important to recognize that several components of the project are proceeding concurrently in order to maintain the desired project timeline. As the project continues to evolve, additional requirements, technical studies, and associated costs may emerge that were not anticipated during initial planning. Staff acknowledge that the costs associated with the geotechnical assessment were not included in existing budget planning for this stage of the process and represent an unforeseen expenditure necessary to support the next phase of project development.

4.2 Risks with the Proposed Solution

Staff are not aware of specific risks with the proposed solution. Should funding not be identified and this work not proceed, it could impact the confidence of the outcome of the RFP and costing associated with the design build of a new arena and walking track should that project proceed.

It is unknown whether any third-party organization is available to perform this work within the timeframe required to support the preferred project timeline outcome.

4.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

No additional workplan impacts are anticipated with the proposed solution.

4.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

The proposed funding will enable completion of the geotechnical assessment required to support the next phase of project planning and procurement. Undertaking this work prior to the RFP submission deadline will provide proponents with critical site information, resulting in more informed design submissions and reduced project risk. The assessment will also support better decision-making by improving cost certainty and identifying potential site constraints early in the process.

In addition, timely completion of the geotechnical work will help maintain the overall project schedule and support the continued advancement of a project intended to provide long-term recreation, health, and community benefits to residents throughout the Castlegar and District area.

4.5 Leveraging Technology

Not applicable

4.5 Measuring Success

Success will be measured through the timely completion of the geotechnical assessment work.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION(S)

No alternative solutions are identified.

5.1 Financial Considerations of the Alternative Solution(s)

Not applicable

5.2 Risks with the Alternative Solution(s)

Not applicable

5.3 Resource Allocation and Workplan Impact

Not applicable

5.4 Public Benefit and Stakeholder Engagement of Proposed Solution

Not applicable

5.5 Measuring Success

Not applicable

6.0 OPTIONS CONSIDERED BUT NOT PRESENTED

No options were considered that have not been presented.

7.0 OPTIONS SUMMARY

Option 1: City of Castlegar and Area J to provide funding for the geotechnical assessment

Recommendation:

That the Commission recommend that the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J provide funding from their respective financial resources to undertake the geotechnical assessment required to advance the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project and support the next phase of project development.

Option 2: Geotechnical assessment not proceed at this time.

Recommendation:

This option is not recommended.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission recommend that the City of Castlegar and Electoral Area J provide funding from their respective financial resources to undertake the geotechnical assessment required to advance the Castlegar & District Arena and Walking Track Project and support the next phase of project development.

Respectfully submitted,



Trisha Davison, General Manager of Community Services

CONCURRENCE

General Manager of IT, Procurement, and Finance – Yev Malloff – Digitally Approved

Regional Manager of Operations & Asset Management – Craig Stanley 

Senior Project Manager – AJ Evenson 