RESORT VILLAGE OF KIVIMAA-MOONLIGHT BAY

SASKATCHEWAN

Public Information Meeting

Saturday, November 14, 2026

PART 1

Thunderchild Addition to Reserve (ATR)

Council presentation - pages 2-7

PART 2

Community Information Session

Council presentation - pages 8-12

Prepared presentation materials shared in the order presented at the meeting.
These materials are not official Council minutes or a verbatim transcript.

Thunderchild ATR Public Meeting Script

Good morning and thank you for joining us. We have been told the Addition to Reserve process for Thunderchild's former store and gas bar property is nearing completion. With important questions still unanswered, Council and Administration have a responsibility to update residents.

Addition to Reserve, or ATR, is the federal process through which land becomes reserve land. The final decision rests with the federal government, not Village Council, and we have not been included in those decision-making discussions.

Throughout this process, Council has continued to raise concerns, ask questions and seek changes to the existing agreement. However, any changes to that agreement require both the Village and Thunderchild First Nation to agree.

The Municipal Services and Compatibility Agreement, or MSA, was signed in 2010 by a previous Council. It was not signed by the current Council. At that time, the property operated as a convenience store and gas bar, providing services that benefited both communities. The Village entered the agreement in good faith to build a strong partnership.

Sixteen years later, those circumstances have changed. The business has closed, the building has deteriorated, and property conditions have prompted enforcement under our Nuisance Bylaw. Council has raised safety and environmental concerns.

Yet the previous Council's signature continues to be relied on as a reason to retain the existing agreement. Council feels the Village's goodwill is being held against its efforts to address today's problems. We believe that willingness to cooperate should support a renewed partnership and an updated agreement.

Residents have invested in their homes, cabins and this community. The property at 2 Waino's Road sits in the centre of our resort village, surrounded by homes and close to our beach and recreation areas. Its condition and future use could affect neighbouring properties, traffic, safety and the character of our Village.

Our current zoning does not permit office use. In 2018, Thunderchild proposed using this property as a Child and Family Services office, which would have required a zoning amendment from the Village.

In 2021, Thunderchild again proposed using the property for office purposes, this time as a training facility. The Village directed that the unpermitted training facility use be discontinued and also identified a travel trailer on the property as a zoning violation.

Council was able to address these issues because the property was, and remains, subject to the Village's zoning and bylaws.

What concerns Council is that once this property becomes reserve land, we may no longer have that same authority.

The 2010 agreement includes commitments to consultation and compatibility with Village bylaws, but it also allows Thunderchild to establish its own bylaws. If disagreements arise over whether a particular use is compatible with the surrounding community, the agreement directs those disputes to court.

Council is concerned that these provisions do not provide strong enough assurances that future development will remain compatible with our Village, or an affordable way to resolve disagreements.

This is particularly important given the property's location in the centre of an established residential and recreational community. A significant change in its use could affect the character and atmosphere of the Village that residents have invested in and enjoyed for many years.

Our concern is not simply what the property might be used for today, but how future uses will be managed and what protection the Village and its residents will have if disagreements arise.

Government agencies have told us an office use may be possible after reserve creation. Thunderchild could then pass its own bylaw allowing offices, subject to the agreement's consultation and compatibility requirements. If the Village disputed compatibility, the agreement directs that dispute to court. Our present zoning therefore does not give us a clear guarantee about future use.

We also need an affordable way to recover unpaid payments in lieu of taxes. We do not operate municipal water or sewer systems that could be withheld. Arbitration requires both parties' consent, and court proceedings are too costly for a community our size.

The Village has already spent $16,777.43 on legal fees. This does not include any Administration time.

With our lawyer's assistance, we have also issued an Order to Remedy addressing the tanks and property conditions. Further enforcement may include registering an interest against title. This could require an outstanding title issue to be addressed during the ATR process, but it does not guarantee that the process will stop or be delayed until the tanks are removed.

The MSA identifies a convenience store and gas bar as the intended use in its opening. However, section 2 later refers to services continuing regardless of the activity on the property, and the agreement does not expressly require the store and gas bar to continue operating.

The agreement includes commitments to consultation and compatibility with Village bylaws, which Council recognizes as important. However, Council does not believe these provisions are clearly defined or strong enough to ensure that future land use remains compatible with our Village, or that maintenance, safety and environmental concerns will be properly addressed.

If disagreements arise over compatibility, the agreement directs those disputes to court. For a small municipality like ours, this is neither an affordable nor a practical way to protect neighbouring properties or preserve the character of our Village.

We have repeatedly been told the agreement is between the Village and Thunderchild. With communication so limited with Thunderchild, we have asked both governments to help bring the parties together. We see this as an opportunity for both levels of government to help Thunderchild First Nation and the Resort Village of Kivimaa–Moonlight Bay develop a stronger agreement that benefits both communities and protects the interests of all properties in the Village.

Susan Carani, the Government Relations representative working with us, has told us our concerns have crossed many desks in government and that the federal government still considers the 2010 agreement acceptable. Its stated effective date begins when the land reaches reserve status.

If that is when the agreement takes effect, Council questions why the provincial and federal governments are not more willing to help us renegotiate with Thunderchild before that happens. An agreement that addresses today's problems and concerns, rather than the circumstances that existed 16 years ago. Council believes it is unlikely that this property will operate as a convenience store and gas bar again.

On June 23, 2026, Council provided Thunderchild with written proposals outlining the changes we would like to discuss and negotiate:

- **Environmental protection:** current assessments, safe tank removal, cleanup responsibilities and financial security for future remediation costs.
- **Unsafe buildings and nuisance conditions:** inspection and enforcement responsibilities, repair or removal of unsafe structures, grounds maintenance and firm deadlines.
- **Fire safety:** prevention standards, removal of combustible materials, vegetation management and responsibility for emergency response costs.
- **Future use:** clear zoning and land-use compatibility commitments, consultation before significant changes, and protection of surrounding residential and recreation areas.
- **Payments and disputes:** annual reconciliation, arrears repayment and default deadlines, with mandatory mediation before more expensive arbitration or court proceedings.
- **Insurance:** appropriate liability and environmental coverage, proof of coverage and notice of cancellation or significant changes.
- **Communication:** named contacts, response deadlines, regular meetings and escalation when requests go unanswered.
- **Regular reviews:** joint reviews every five years, including changing risks, financial security and other emerging concerns.

These are proposals for agreement, not protections Council can impose this on its own. We have asked which existing clauses the federal government believes adequately address them and whether our proposals and present property conditions were considered when they found this agreement still adequate. We have also asked how Council can provide informed comments without knowing the intended use, how neighbouring property owners' interests are weighed, and what safeguards address planning, public safety and environmental concerns. We are seeking substantive written answers.

Council and Administration have pursued this through repeated letters, meetings and follow-ups, legal advice, formal nuisance enforcement, requests to provincial and federal offices, and SUMA's advocacy support. We have been trying to have these issues addressed before reserve status is granted.

Minister of Government Relations Eric Schmalz's March 24 letter advised that municipal bylaws apply until reserve status and encouraged us to work with Thunderchild on shared land-use planning and emergency response.

On July 28, Council and Administration met by Zoom with Chelsea from Government Relations; federal ATR representatives Ryan and Trevor; and Julia, listed in the meeting record as Thunderchild's advisor. We raised communication, safety, the tanks and the existing agreement. Government Relations agreed to follow up on the tanks and review whether the agreement could be updated. We left feeling that the Village had few practical options, despite the concerns we raised.

At that meeting, we understood the goal in the ATR process is to be that someone walking through a community would not notice a difference between reserve land and the rest of the municipality. Council wants clear, enforceable commitments that make that goal meaningful here.

We have also spoken with the Minister of Highways. We appreciate MP Rosemarie Falk raising the Village's concerns in Ottawa and helping obtain follow-up from Government Relations. Elias Nelson, Chief of Staff to Saskatchewan's Minister of Government Relations, contacted us following her intervention. We have also sought SUMA's advocacy support. Advisor Dustin Austman reported he found difficulty obtaining information or specifics from Indigenous Services Canada.

We have asked the Minister of Environment, Darlene Rowden, to require an updated environmental assessment, particularly given the property's history as a gas bar and its close proximity to Turtle Lake.

We have been told that earlier environmental work is considered sufficient. However, Council continues to question whether information gathered approximately 15 years ago accurately reflects the property's current condition. We also have concerns about relying on a visual review conducted in November 2011, particularly given the seasonal conditions that may have limited what could be observed. Council believes an updated environmental assessment is a reasonable request.

We have also asked the Ministry of Environment whether the underground fuel tanks have been properly decommissioned and whether anyone has confirmed if residual fuel remains in these aging tanks. To date, we have not received answers to these questions. Given the potential safety and environmental risks, Council believes these are reasonable questions for the Ministry to address.

The Ministry's Public Inquiries unit confirmed that our May 5 concerns were forwarded to the Environmental Protection Branch. Its response suggested us to contact TIPP with our concern for suspected pollution, and the Water Security Agency for water-related concerns. We were also advised that the Environmental Protection Branch might not respond directly because the Village does not own the property.

While we appreciate these referrals, they have not answered Council's questions about the property's current environmental condition, whether the fuel tanks have been properly decommissioned, or

whether residual fuel remains. Council believes these matters should be addressed before the property becomes reserve land.

We have also raised the building's condition with Government Relations. There has been some progress, as the old ice cream shack and outdoor deep freezers have been dealt with. However, questions about the main building and its future use remain.

Council has also asked whether Thunderchild would consider selling the property. We did not propose a purchase price; we were simply asking whether they would be open to discussing that possibility. There was no response.

We have repeatedly asked what is intended for this property. We were told there were no plans, while also being told grants had been worked on with the property in mind and council and Administration were invited to a meal, handshakes and a photo opportunity. When we asked the purpose, we were told it would be revealed at the meeting. We were also told the meeting was wanted before the election.

Council respectfully declined the photo op and meeting until clear information could be shared that allows us to understand the proposal and its implications for residents.

Council has passed a resolution to approach the media. However, our lawyer subsequently advised that this may not be in the Village's best interests, and we are taking that advice seriously.

The Resort Village supports respectful relationships with Thunderchild. We congratulate the new chief and welcome open discussion with newly elected chief, Michael Linklater, and new council. We are hopeful that new discussions may help resolve some of our concerns and strengthen the partnership that past council was trying to achieve by signing the municipal servicing agreement in 2010. We do not want the Resort village to be tied to an agreement from the past. These new discussions can create a new relationship that represents the future for both communities. Clear answers can help relieve concerns and give residents a better understanding of what comes next.

We do not believe it is fair for today's Council, future Councils or residents to carry the uncertainty and expense of an outdated agreement that does not clearly address this property's present condition. We will continue to seek a stronger agreement before reserve creation, so that a well-maintained development can benefit both communities and respect the character of our Village. We will continue sharing confirmed information with residents.

Residents who wish to raise their concerns can write to Saskatchewan's Ministry of Government Relations. You can ask what safeguards will protect neighbouring properties and residents' investments if the property's use changes or if property is not maintained. You can also ask how the ATR process will consider the character of our resort village and the interests of the surrounding community. Your questions can help government understand how this property's future affects you.

We are not asking the Province to choose one community over another. We are asking for fairness, transparency and a process that recognizes that decisions involving land in the centre of an existing municipality can have permanent consequences for everyone surrounding it.

If you have any questions, please call or email the office. We will now be moving to another topic that is concerning many ratepayers.

RESORT VILLAGE OF KIVIMAA–MOONLIGHT BAY

Community Information Session

During 2026, the Resort Village received notification of complaints or reviews involving various provincial regulatory agencies. Each of these matters has required Administration to gather information, respond to questions and provide documentation

Council feels it is important that residents understand the impact these matters have had on our Village. Residents have every right to raise concerns, seek information and hold their elected Council accountable. However, Council also has a responsibility to explain how municipal resources are being used and ensure Administration can continue serving the entire community.

The completion of our new accessible public beach washroom and shower was a significant accomplishment for a resort village of our size. The Village successfully secured $51,380 in federal accessibility funding to help make this project possible.

Unfortunately, recently much of the attention following this achievement has been directed toward responding to complaints and questions about the facility.

Our building inspector forwarded questions he had received from a resident, advising that these were municipal matters. Administration then contacted Building and Technical Standards to determine whether it had also received inquiries and was advised that yes approximately 50 questions had been submitted concerning the washroom.

Administration had previously been advised that an inspection was not required for this particular facility because it was classified as an accessory building under 300 square feet.

When Administration contacted Saskatchewan Building and Technical Standards regarding the complaints, we were advised that these matters were the responsibility of the municipality. Under Saskatchewan's Construction Codes Act, municipalities are responsible for administering building permits and enforcing building standards, with the assistance of their appointed building officials.

Nevertheless, to address the concerns raised and hopefully prevent further complaints, Administration has now arranged for our building inspector to review the engineered plans, examine photographs documenting the various stages of construction, and conduct a final inspection of the completed facility. This review comes at a cost to the Village but hopes it will provide further assurance that the project meets the applicable building requirements. It is disappointing that so much time and additional expense have been necessary following what should be a positive achievement for our community

Public Health also contacted Administration regarding a complaint containing 11 questions about the facility's water supply and other concerns. Several questions were answered during the telephone conversation, until Administration requested that any remaining questions be provided in writing to maintain an accurate record of the concerns and responses. We have not received any further follow-up from Public Health regarding this matter.

As many residents know, the Village makes use of fallen trees and trees that need to be removed throughout the community. Rather than letting this wood go to waste, it is prepared and sold to residents, with the proceeds supporting our Fire Department and recreation activities.

Previously, we received an email questioning how the village tracks its firewood supply and sales and how the money is handled. Our firewood supply depends on trees that need to be removed, and all sales are recorded through our Muni soft accounting system, with the revenues included in our annual independent audit. This information was sent to the resident by email.

Later an OHS officer showed up to the office with a complaint. The OHS complaint involved two photographs taken from the Village's Facebook page approximately two years apart. One showed our volunteer firefighters generously helping with a fundraising effort, while the more recent photograph showed bags of firewood being offered for sale. Together, the photographs were presented as suggesting that volunteers were currently carrying out this work.

Administration explained the difference in dates and invited the OHS officer to inspect our municipal office and shop.

The officer provided positive feedback, recognized that fundraising activities of this nature are common in small communities, and explained that the volunteer activities in question were outside OHS's mandate. He was also pleased that municipal employees receive chainsaw safety training.

We were notified by the Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority (SLGA) concerning our golf cart raffle, which was organized to help raise funds for the new pickleball court.

This was another community fundraising initiative that our community was particularly proud of. Many residents, volunteers, Council members and Administration contributed their time selling tickets, and through everyone's efforts, we were able to raise funds toward a new recreational facility for our Village.

The raffle proceeds had already been included in the Village's annual financial audit conducted by our independent accountant. Following the complaint, SLGA also conducted its own review of the raffle.

We are pleased to report that both reviews were completed without any compliance concerns being identified.

Saskatchewan Water Security Agency contacted the office following concerns raised about the village's drainage and stormwater management, whether proper permits were in place, and how we maintain our public beaches and boat launches.

What was particularly disappointing to Council was that these drainage concerns had already been discussed at an earlier public meeting and addressed through email correspondence with residents. Council had openly acknowledged the challenges with our drainage and stormwater management and informed residents that the village had secured support through the CRIS Green Infrastructure

program to explore better, long-term solutions, without requiring funding from the Village's municipal tax revenues for this stage of the project.

For this reason, Council felt that involving another provincial agency at that stage was unnecessary when residents had already been informed of the work underway.

Water Security Agency advised that municipal drainage management falls within the municipality's responsibilities. We were also advised that public beaches and boat launches can be maintained for recreational use, subject to applicable requirements.

To ensure the Agency had a full understanding of our operations, Administration invited its representatives to visit the village and review our drainage practices and maintenance activities firsthand. The Agency declined, indicating that it did not feel a site visit was necessary at that time.

During Picnic in the Park, several volunteers approached Administration after noticing photographs being taken of them, which made them uncomfortable. We also heard from sponsors who had been questioned why they would support the Village.

Following Picnic in the Park, Administration was notified of another SLGA review, this time concerning how sponsorships, ticket sales and donation receipts were handled.

We are pleased to report that the review found no concerns with how these funds and records were handled. We did, however, learn that a raffle licence was required for our 50/50 draw, even for a draw of this size. Going forward, the Village will ensure the appropriate licence is obtained.

Our local event depends on the generosity of our volunteers, sponsors and residents, who contribute their time, money and efforts to make these events possible. Their contributions deserve to be recognized and appreciated.

On August 5, 2026, Administration received a formal request for information under The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, commonly known as LA FOIP.

The request sought extensive financial audit records for the years 2022 through 2025, including management letters from our external auditor, emails, correspondence regarding recommendations, Council reports and records showing how those recommendations had been addressed.

It also requested nearly ten years of records, dating back to January 1, 2017, concerning the pumping or discharge of water into Turtle Lake. These included permits, approvals, applications, email correspondence with the Water Security Agency, Council meeting records and any other related documentation.

This was not simply a matter of retrieving a few documents. Administration estimated that this one request would require approximately 41 hours and 10 minutes of work — more than a full working week for one employee.

What made this particularly concerning was that much of the information being requested related to matters Council and Administration had already spent considerable time addressing.

So, on August 11, Administration applied back to the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner for permission to disregard the August 5 request. This was not a decision taken lightly.

On September 24, 2026, the Commissioner granted the Village's application under sections 43.1(2)(a) and 43.1(2)(b) of LA FOIP, authorizing Administration to discontinue processing the August 5 request and provided us a Disregard Decision 285-2026 this is now a public available record in the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner website.

After reviewing the correspondence and history of requests, the Commissioner made several significant findings.

In paragraph 22, the Commissioner acknowledged the importance of responding to requests for information but found that this applicant had demanded and received an inordinate amount of Village time responding to:

> *"an unending list of questions that are unrelated, repetitive and at times, downright abusive in their demands."*

The Commissioner also considered the effect this was having on the municipality's ability to carry out its regular responsibilities.

In paragraph 25, the Commissioner stated:

> *"Further, it is not in the public interest that this tiny Resort Village administration be monopolized by never-ending requests for information on the part of this Applicant."*

And

> *"In the context of the many detailed responses that have already been fashioned for the benefit of the Applicant, this office cannot allow the local authority to pursue one more meritless venture."*

Perhaps one of the strongest observations came in paragraph 28, where the Commissioner stated:

> *"We caution the Applicant that the local authority does not exist for the prime reason of serving any whimsical information requests they may have on an ongoing basis."*

And

> *"An Applicant must approach a local authority with the same deference and respect that they expect to receive from the local authority."*

The Commissioner was shared the question that admiration was given before our July 17 Annual General Meeting, 37 questions. prepared written responses and information were made available to residents. When the answers were challenged, Administration went back through the questions and provided further explanations.

In paragraph 21 of the report finding, the Commissioner described the August 5 request concerning previously addressed subjects as:

> *“a clear abuse of the freedom of information legislative scheme in this province.”*

The Commissioner went on to describe the breadth and scope of the repeated questions as:

> *“nothing more than outright harassment.”*

These are not Council's descriptions of the resident's conduct. They are the findings of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner following an independent review of the information submitted.

This ruling does not prevent residents from asking questions or making future requests for information. It recognizes that the right to access information must also be balanced with the municipality's ability to carry out its responsibilities.

At the July 22, 2026, special meeting. Council set aside $25,000 for potential legal expenses associated with these resident-related matters. This was funding allocated for that purpose, not an amount already spent. Council has also directed Administration to track the actual expenses incurred in responding to and defending the Village's interests in these matters, so residents can be informed of the financial impact on our community.

We respect the right to ask questions and hold Council accountable. At the same time, we have a responsibility to protect the resources of our small municipality and ensure we can continue serving everyone.