

The motions **EASC 304/23** and **305/23** represent the formal legislative resolution to a significant equity dispute in **Electoral Area D**. By recommending **100% reimbursement** for "early adopters" who voluntarily paid for water meters, the committee sought to correct a fairness gap created by a **\$2.8 million provincial grant**.

The Technical Resolution: 119 Eligible Properties

The recommendation in **EASC 305/23** specifically targeted residents who took proactive steps toward conservation before the universal program made meters free for the remaining 1,100 connections.

- **Eligibility Criteria:** To protect public funds, the committee established two strict conditions: the installation must have been **voluntary** with a **known cost**, and the **original owner** who paid the fee must still own the property.
- **The Breakdown:** Out of the 182 total meters already in the system, only **119 properties** met these combined criteria. This includes **114 active original owners** who paid the \$1,500 flat fee and **5 owners** who paid actual costs to the City of Campbell River before 2018.
- **Exclusions:** Those who purchased homes where a meter was already installed (9 properties) and mandatory or commercial connections (39 properties) were excluded from the rebate.

Governance Context: "Phase 1" of Targeted Friction

While the motions show Directors Mawhinney and Rice working together to move the file, our conversation history and the sources identify this as the starting point for **"hostage-taking" politics** within the regional district.

- **Strategic Obstruction:** This routine utility file was initially targeted for **procedural gridlock** by the rural block (Mawhinney, Whalley, and Vonesch). They attempted to block these refunds as political leverage following their loss on the democratic vote to explore the **Strathcona Gardens** expansion.
- **Failure of Accountability:** This tactic has been characterized as a violation of **Bylaw No. 513 (Code of Conduct)**, specifically the principles of **Integrity** and **Accountability**, as it weaponized the financial relief of Area D residents to settle an unrelated regional dispute.

Impact on the 2026 Election Narrative

- **Defending the "Forward" Platform:** You can present this successful reimbursement as proof of your ability to secure massive infrastructure grants while ensuring **fiscal fairness** for your constituents, despite the "procedural obstructionism" of your peers.
- **Accountability for Incumbents:** This record allows for sharp debate questions asking why the rural block was willing to use **working families as "political pawns"** by initially trying to block their \$1,500 refunds.
- **Contrast in Stability:** The eventual passage of these motions demonstrates the type of **corporate continuity** you advocate for—where routine business is processed based on its technical merits rather than as leverage for "backroom quorum-busting" tactics.

In summary, although the **EASC 305/23** motion provided a fair outcome for 119 local families, the sources suggest its path was marked by the first phase of **targeted administrative friction** that has fundamentally shaped the political "showdown" of the 2023–2026 term.