

The motion recorded in **SRD 838/24**, moved by you (**Director John Rice**) and seconded by **Director Mark Vonesch**, represents a significant escalation in your advocacy for the residents of **Upper Campbell Lake**. By demanding a formal meeting or a detailed position letter from **BC Hydro**, the Board is challenging the utility's refusal to compensate property owners for ongoing **shoreline erosion**, a critical issue that intersects with the broader struggle for community electrification.

1. Technical Conflict: The BC Hydro Refusal

The motion was triggered by formal correspondence from BC Hydro (Ted Olynyk, Community Relations Manager) which delivered a "no-funding" stance regarding shoreline protection.

- **The Utility's Position:** BC Hydro explicitly stated they do not offer grants to reservoir-adjacent residents and concluded that implementing physical erosion control is neither "necessary nor likely to be effective".
- **The Disputed Data:** BC Hydro based its refusal on a specific study (**JHTMON-11**) and evaluations from its own engineering geologists. Motion SRD 838/24 forces BC Hydro to defend these technical findings directly to the affected residents and the Regional District.
- **Safety and Livability:** For these residents, shoreline erosion isn't just an environmental concern; it threatens property stability in a remote area that already lacks basic electrical and cellular infrastructure.

2. Strategic Context: Connecting Erosion and Electrification

This advocacy for erosion compensation is inextricably linked to your "Forward" platform's work on **Electoral Area D electrification**.

- **Resurrecting the File:** While the electrification project was abruptly canceled by BC Hydro in 2015, you have successfully resurrected it, demanding updated 2024 pricing (\$5.6 million) and exploring alternative routes.
- **Infrastructure Parity:** Your message to BC Hydro is clear: if the utility maintains that residents must pay millions to connect to the grid while simultaneously refusing to address the operational impacts of their reservoirs (erosion), then a high-level, face-to-face accountability session is required.

3. Governance Dynamics: Functional Cooperation

The procedural handling of this motion highlights a moment of **corporate stability** and team-oriented leadership:

- **Unified Advocacy:** Carrying this motion unanimously (with Director Kerr returning for the vote) ensures the SRD speaks with a single, powerful voice to the Provincial Government and BC Hydro.

4. Strategic Campaign Application for 2026

In the context of the **October 17, 2026 election**, this record provides evidence of your **proactive advocacy**:

- **The Narrative:** You can prove to voters that you are not afraid to take on large provincial crown corporations. While others might offer "silent opposition," you are

documented here demanding that BC Hydro provide transparency and fairness to Upper Campbell Lake families.

In summary, carrying motion **SRD 838/24** fulfills your commitment to **data-backed transparency** and active community engagement. It transitions the shoreline erosion issue from a private resident grievance into a formal, board-led demand for institutional accountability 11, 14.