

The motions recorded in **SRD 362/25 and 363/25** represent a significant victory for the "rural block's" preferred model of ad-hoc community grants, but they also serve as a primary flashpoint in the ongoing debate over **fiscal stewardship and federal grant eligibility**, 1465. By directing \$100,000 from the **Cortes Island Community Works Fund (CWF/Gas Tax)** to a third-party foundation project, the Board has bypassed your platform's push for a standardized, accountable policy in favor of localized directorial discretion.

1. Technical Context: Funding the "Village Commons"

The **Village Commons Project** is a cultural infrastructure initiative located on **Cortes Island Community Foundation** land Query.

- **Project Scope:** Previous updates describe the project as including a **shared workspace, outdoor pavilion, and a potential food bank depot**.
- **The Funding Source:** The \$100,000 is drawn from the **Community Works Fund**, a federal-provincial transfer formerly known as the Gas Tax Fund.
- **The Eligibility Conflict:** While CWF agreements allow for "cultural infrastructure," they are primarily intended for the **construction or material enhancement of local public infrastructure**. Proponents of your "Forward" platform have consistently argued that utilizing these funds for infrastructure on land owned by a **third-party society**—rather than a Regional District-owned asset—falls outside the intended mandate of the 2024–2034 agreement.

2. Strategic Governance: Ad-Hoc vs. Standardized Spending

Motion **SRD 363/25** highlights the fundamental divide between your approach to corporate stability and the rural block's focus on "billing politics":

- **The "Rural Block" Strategy:** Led by **Director Vonesch** and supported by **Directors Mawhinney and Whalley**, this faction views Gas Tax funds as a flexible tool for localized community grants.
- **The "Forward" Counter-Argument:** You, along with **Mayor Dahl and Director Sinnott**, have advocated for a "full analysis" (via SRD 625/24) to end ad-hoc spending. Your group argues that giving Gas Tax money to third parties sends a signal to senior government funders that the SRD lacks internal infrastructure deficits, potentially **jeopardizing millions** in future structural grants for water, transit, and fire protection.

3. Governance Dynamics: The "Island Alliance" in the Lead

The mover and seconder patterns for these motions document the "rural block" working in tight procedural tandem:

- **Unified Support:** The receipt of the report was moved by **Director Mawhinney** and seconded by **Director Whalley**. The substantive funding directive was moved by **Director Vonesch** and seconded by **Director Mawhinney**.
- **Bypassing the Audit:** This allocation occurred despite the Board's earlier decision (SRD 854/24) to **defer similar Gas Tax requests** until a professional policy was finalized to resolve "chronic administrative friction".

4. Strategic Campaign Application for 2026

In the context of the **October 17, 2026 election**, this record serves as a factual anchor to

challenge the fiscal responsibility of your opponents :

- **The Narrative:** You can prove to voters that you are the only candidate protecting the region's **long-term grant eligibility**.
- **The Message:** *"I am moving Area D **forward** by demanding that our infrastructure funds are spent with integrity. While my opponents voted to give \$100,000 in federal money to a third-party foundation, I am fighting to ensure those dollars are reserved for the 'pipes and pavement' our families depend on—like our water and fire protection. We cannot risk millions in future grants to satisfy the ad-hoc spending whims of a single director".*

In summary, the carrying of **SRD 363/25** provides the administrative record of a community choosing localized grants over regional fiscal policy. It documents your role as a **principled steward** who supports community wins but refuses to treat federal infrastructure reserves as "political pawns".