Referred for Action

(1) Hollyburn Sailing Club, January 11, 2016, regarding Ambleside Vision and Stakeholder Panel (Referred to Director of Planning and Development Services for consideration and response)

(2) January 8, 2016, regarding “Assessments and Taxes” (Referred to Director of Financial Services for consideration and response)

(3) January 12, 2016, regarding “Public Consultation -- Five Year Financial Plan 2016-20 & Proposed 10.5% “Asset Levy” -- January 2016” (Referred to Director of Financial Services for consideration and response)

(4) January 8, 2016, regarding “cutting of boulevard trees” (Referred to Director of Parks, Culture and Community Services for consideration and response)

(5) January 9, 2016, regarding “Re. Preservation of West Vancouver trees” (Referred to Director of Parks, Culture and Community Services for consideration and response)

(6) January 12, 2016, regarding OCP - Policy Section A - “Climate Action” (Referred to Director of Engineering and Environment Services for consideration and response)

Referred for Action from Other Governments and Government Agencies

(7) Hon. N. Yamamoto, Minister of State for Emergency Preparedness, January 11, 2016, regarding “Discussion of the Emergency Program Act” (Referred to Chief Administrative Officer for consideration and response)

Received for Information

(8) West Vancouver Arts Centre Trust, January 8, 2016, regarding “Chair’s Reception- January 20th”

(9) Creative BC, January 8, 2016, regarding Appreciation for Continued Support of British Columbia’s Motion Picture Industry

Received for Information from Other Governments and Government Agencies

No items.

Responses to Correspondence

(10) Manager of Roads and Transportation, January 11, 2016, response to HUB North Shore, “Improving Safety on the Sprit Trail”

(11) Manager of Legislative Services, January 12, 2016, response to Variety, 50th Anniversary of Variety’s Show of Hearts Telethon (Request for Proclamation)
From: Mike Bretner s.22(1) on behalf of commodore@hollyburnsailingclub.ca
Sent: January-11-16 8:51 AM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Letter from Hollyburn Sailing Club Commodore
Attachments: Nov 20 letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

The Honourable Michael Smith, Mayor,
Members of the Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC, V7V 3T3

Please see attached letter.

Thank you,

Mike Bretner, 2016 Hollyburn Sailing Club Commodore.
The Honourable Michael Smith, Mayor
and Members of the Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC, V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor Smith and Councilors,

I am writing to you again, on behalf of the Hollyburn Sailing Club, with a concern that may interest any West Vancouver people and groups impacted by the Ambleside development vision.

To achieve success, the Ambleside vision must be accepted by a majority of West Vancouver residents. We suggest that the best way to achieve this goal is to create a stakeholder panel, similar to that in the upper lands planning process, to bring together the differing views of appropriate waterfront development. Further, the subsequent array of potential visions created by this stakeholder panel needs, at a minimum, a conceptual evaluation including financial, environmental and social impacts before the public can truly decide what is the best way to proceed.

As an occupant of Ambleside for over 50 years, the Hollyburn Sailing Club endeavours to be a strong and vibrant partner in the future waterfront development – please give us the opportunity.

[Signature]

Don Smith
Commodore, Hollyburn Sailing Club
From: [Redacted]  
Sent: January-08-16 3:56 PM  
To: Mayor and Council  
Subject: Assessments and Taxes

Dear Sirs and Madames,

There seems to be a lot of talk about the huge increases in assessments, but assessments aren't the problem, the resulting taxes are. Since taxes are calculated by multiplying the mill rate by the assessment, it seems to me that fiscally responsible municipal governments should lower their mill rates so that overall taxes remain roughly the same. After all, just because supply and demand, a lot of it from foreign investors, is pushing house prices up, that doesn't mean that the cost of collecting garbage and operating community centres has gone up by 25%. Municipal budgets don't need to increase much, if at all, so the mill rate should be lowered.

What are your thoughts on that?

Respectfully,

[Redacted]  
West Vancouver, BC
From: [Name]
Sent: January-12-16 8:16 AM
To: MayorandCouncil
Subject: Public Consultation -- Five Year Financial Plan 2016-20 & Proposed 10.5% "Asset Levy" -- January 2016
Attachments: Calendar of Events _ District of West Vancouver_as_at_20160112-7'16AM.pdf

Your Worship,

I've just now (7:16 AM) checked the Community Calendar published on the District’s website. See appended screen print copy (<Ctrl>P). There are no meetings scheduled after tomorrow’s meeting on community art. None are scheduled for public consultation on the proposed “Asset Levy” or the as yet to be proposed 2016-20 Five Financial Plan.

There are 2-1/2 weeks remaining in the month of January in which to undertake public consultations on the proposed measures pertaining to the financial plan and 2016 taxation, but to hold 3 meetings in that short period with the lack of preparation which is evident from last evening’s council meeting presentation is a little on the ambitious side (at least for West Vancouver), although it would undoubtedly lead to a low turnout.

With respect to your observation that the public can always comment in a council meeting at an agenda item pertaining to the financial plan, and that this constitutes public consultation, is not really to the point—of course members of the public can, it’s guaranteed by the rules that govern council procedure—but what can one usefully say about a complex financial plan in three minutes? Not much, I’d wager. And in the past 15 years, more so in the earlier part of that 15 years than in the latter four years, a significant effort at community outreach to obtain public input and engage in a meaningful process of public consultation has been the norm, not the exception.

This year, the financial department is seeking public input on the question of an “Asset Levy” in the amount that according to last evening’s presentation by Ms. Gordon (Director of Finance) that would entail up to a 10.5% increase in property taxes on top of an already baked-in 2.1% increase to cover a rise in General Fund operating costs arising from labour contract wage and benefit escalation schedules (5.5% for police wages and benefits, 2.2% for fire & rescue wages and benefits, and 2% for all other employees). Bottom line, the proposed increase could be as great as a 12.6% year over year increase in taxes levied for the “average” residential property (approximately double that for properties which have seen a 30% increase in their tax assessment values in 2016) depending on what council decides to do.

The District hasn’t seen property tax rate increases of this magnitude (in percentage rate terms) since the 1980s and early 1990s. Certainly, tax rate increases of this magnitude were not characteristic of the Ron Wood or Pamela Goldsmith-Jones administrations, or the prior council term. This makes it all the more imperative that the current council make an effort to ensure that
1. All relevant information is put into the public domain as early as practicable in a readily accessible format;
2. The public be properly informed of the availability of the information, where it can be obtained, and how;
3. Public consultation is done in an open and transparent manner in forums that promotes rather than restricts public input; and,
4. Council engages the public and undertake a discussion without prejudice on the issues raised by the Director of Finance with a view to arriving at an objective and balanced decision.

This requires a change in the practice and process of public consultation which has come to characterise discussion and decisions around the five year financial plan and current year budget in recent years. The magnitude of the proposed “Asset Levy”, the incredible dollar amounts ($1 billion) which have been alluded to in the three presentations on the since the October 26th presentation, and the omission of the quarterly council reports that
council by resolution in open session in February 2014 directed staff to prepare and present each quarter commencing with a first report in March 2014 on the subject of the long term fiscal sustainability review, have done little to prepare the public for the proposed tax hikes this year.

As chief executive officer of the District Municipality, and as leader of council, it behooves you to put into motion the process of public consultation. Staff’s presentation is merely the “shot across the bow”, alerting council and (presumably, though not necessarily) the public of what is coming down the turnpike. Gone now are the happy days when we could contemplate complaisantly adding more public amenities without thought to the future obligations such acquisitions come with. Staff have now told us that the good ship ‘West Vancouver’ is rotten at its core—the keel is near falling off, the ship’s knees are like Swiss cheese with worm borings, and the engine machinery is in need of critical and immediate overhaul, without which the whole edifice will collapse on itself. Staff now say in effect that “Staying the Course” is a fool’s gambit. Little did we know.

In sum, we need to hold a frank and open discussion and debate on the future course of action, the trade-offs that will be needed, and what we will fund and what we will not fund going forward, because money no longer grows on trees here, and if it hasn’t yet become apparent to most people in West Van, it is certainly very apparent to most people outside of West Van that the country and its economy are not doing well, and that situation is likely to become worse before it becomes better (if it ever does become better, and there’s no guarantee that it will).

Thanks are due to senior staff for bringing this situation so forcefully to our attention. It’s now up to the electors, once staff have put together all the information we will need, to engage in that discussion out of which a consensus will hopefully be produced which will take us forward for the next ten years or so. Your role in this, if I may be so bold as to presume on your prerogatives, is to set the ball in motion and ensure that the process is open, transparent, accountable, inclusive and effective.

Sincerely,

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)
### JANUARY 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (All day) Dundarave Festival of Light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:00am: The 2016 Bipolar Bear Swim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (All day) Dundarave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00am Public Art Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm Public Art Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm Public Art Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ONLINE SERVICES**
- Parking tickets
- Pay for permit
- Renew dog licence
- Renew: business licence
- Fire department invoices
- MyDistrict
- westvancouverITE

**ARTS AND RECREATION**
- Recreational schedule
- Leisure Guide website
- Community centres
- Golf tee times
- Summer camps
- Venue rentals

**HOME AND PROPERTY**
- Garbage calendar
- Permits & licences
- Property taxes
- Environment
- Emergency preparedness
- Water conservation

**ABOUT WEST VAN**
- Mayor & Council
- Council agendas
- Volunteer
- Accessibility
- School District
- Career Portal
- Finances & budget
- Privacy policy

**STAY CONNECTED**
- Send a message
- Report a problem
- 604 925 7000
- All municipal contacts
- Sign up for e-news
Dear Mayor and Council

Re: Cutting of two majestic boulevard trees on 11th Street @1175 11th Street.

Having looked down the hill from our home at [s. 22(1)] and admired these two magnificent boulevard trees (one had a diameter of 3 feet; the other had a 4 foot diameter; with estimated ages of 180 and 240 years (as per internet information)), my wife and I are absolutely heartbroken and frustrated that these trees were cut today for no apparent reason. This is particularly frustrating since the trees were surrounded by the now required orange protection fence. Since we have however still no bylaw that allows the Municipality to fine the builder and hopefully the tree cutter the orange protection fence is simply a cruel joke as far as I am concerned.

I have talked with Krista Braathen, the Field Arborist, today and asked her to please check with Planning if anybody had given permission for this action and to see if the Municipality has any means of penalizing the guilty party.

In closing I would like to say that if I had seen the actual cutting of the trees today I would have confronted the tree cutter and tried to stop the illegal action. Is this what concerned citizens now have to consider doing since the Municipality seems to have no way of stopping these illegal acts?

I would very much appreciate a response to my letter and the concerns expressed since I assume that you all would share these concerns.

Best regards,

[s. 22(1)]

West Vancouver
Tel. s. 22(1)
From: 
Sent: January-09-16 12:38 PM 
To: Mayor and Council 
Cc: Nina Leemhuis; Jim Bailey; Anne Mooi; Sandra Bicego; Stephen Mikicich; Krista Braathen 
Subject: Re: Preservation of West Vancouver trees 

Dear Mayor and Council of West Vancouver,

Please refer to the two attached PDF files - most important is our letter dated today - Jan. 9, 2016; for further reference the other attachment is our previous letter of April 21, 2014 - close to two years ago.

We look forward to your responses and actions.

Sincerely,

West Vancouver, BC
Mayor and Council of West Vancouver
750 17th Street
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

January 9, 2016

Mayor Michael Smith
Mary-Ann Booth, Councilor
Craig Cameron, Councilor
Christine Cassidy, Councilor
Nora Gambioli, Councilor
Michael Lewis, Councilor
Bill Soprovich, Councilor

Re: Preservation of West Vancouver’s Vital Urban Forests

Dear Mayor and Councilors of West Vancouver:
With his permission, I was forwarded the recent letter sent to council by the concerned West Vancouver resident, expressing his sadness and frustration over the complete lack of bylaws to protect the trees comprising West Vancouver’s urban forests. As he notes, this lack of by-law protection led to the recent demise of two beautiful old-growth conifer trees in his neighborhood. Unfortunately this has happened time and time again, and it must come to an immediate halt. Several West Vancouver residents share the exact sentiments of and collectively we need to see that council is committed to implementing a strong strategic plan for tree preservation in West Vancouver. Your recent approved changes to improve the protection of trees in parks is one step in the right direction, but we need to feel much greater confidence that you will tackle head-on – and with fierce conviction – the protection of trees on municipal lands, and of trees on private properties.

We would like to hear back from council that you agree to embrace a strong commitment to this end and will genuinely and vigorously pursue by-law protection of the trees of West Vancouver; in doing so, we expect council to rely upon the wealth of scientific data to support the multitude and undeniable advantages of preserving trees (see below), instead of relying upon public opinion, which often has a flavor of bias. There is no doubt that tree removal as a result of building overly large homes in West Vancouver, or for relatively trivial considerations such as people’s views is a clear result of owners and builders taking advantage of the lack of any bylaw protection. And tree removal is taking place at a rate that ignores any consideration of sustainability. This is unacceptable to us as concerned residents who want to preserve this spectacular area.

It has been close to 2 years since our letter of April 21, 2014, first requesting action toward tree protection via policy development and implementation. While we are happy that this is underway, we must insist that Council has an ironclad strategic vision for making this happen, and a true commitment to seeing this through. As per the attached earlier letter of April 21, 2014, we noted that several municipalities and cities have rules in place to govern the removal/cutting of trees on private properties. We believe that you could readily consult with their respective councils concerning the strategies and education tools that were used by them to move forward on this. In fact it was ~1.5 years ago that I sent the link to individuals on council to the slide presentation given by Vancouver’s city council in which the City of Vancouver successfully implemented strong by-law protection of trees on private properties.

Clearly there are two action initiatives that must happen:
(1) Prompt establishment and implementation of tree protection by-laws for municipal lands and for private lands and (2) Educating the public. This latter process is critical, but it will take some time, a
luxury that you do not have. Action (1) is required first.

**Policy Must be Linked to Science, Not Public Opinion**

The need for bylaw protection of WV trees is supported by hard facts of science. This past summer has seen unprecedented drought connect to climate change. It is very important to understand the connection between maintaining forest vitality – especially trees comprising the urban forests - and mitigating climate change. The last time we checked the West Vancouver website concerning climate change, there was no mention of this connection, although this could be readily added in the near future.

We appreciated the signs that West Vancouver and the North Shore posted during this past summer in public parks and beaches. They stated something like “This summer is like no other: dry weather, water shortages and extreme fire risk are a real concern across the North Shore. This requires us all to think and act differently”.

We would like to reinforce a similar sentiment concerning protecting West Vancouver’s urban trees as one of the most valuable actions that we can take to offset climate change. The world has reached a crisis stage surrounding climate change and one that should compel us all to think and act differently. Our urban trees are vital to reducing climate change and all of its profound consequences to create a sustainable world for future generations.

There is a wealth of scientific research showing that trees (conifers and deciduous species), along with submerged aquatic vegetation (e.g. kelps and sea grasses) are the MOST critical organisms for mitigating climate change – they do so via sequestering carbon during the process of photosynthesis. Further, trees – by preventing run-off, make our food systems sustainable, in part by reducing agricultural wastes (pesticides and herbicides) in our rivers, streams and oceans, and by maintaining the general health and vitality of our air, oceans and coastlines. The scientific evidence is not just compelling – it is irrefutable.

The value of the trees comprising the “urban forests” is additionally underscored by studies defining a financial perspective. Considerable press surrounded the study conducted within the City of Toronto that compared the value of harvesting the trees of the city versus the monetary value of saving those trees. This study showed that it is the latter that “won” the contest – and by a large margin – in fact municipalities - by saving trees - are spared millions of dollars of costs associated with flooding damage to homes, wind damage, noise pollution and so on. On the North Shore, the costs saved would further pertain to wildlife “control” (as per our attached letter of April 21, 2014).

We hope that this letter conveys that several West Vancouver residents would like to see urgent attention to tree protection regulations being put in place for West Vancouver. We ask that you pursue serious and strong actions toward tree protection – and that you base your motivation appropriately upon the wealth of scientific data that is already available concerning the value of trees, rather than on public opinions. Relying upon solid evidence is the only way forward to ensure that West Vancouver will remain one of the most desirable regions in North America and indeed worldwide.

Trees on private properties in fact comprise a significant proportion of the “urban forests”. Protecting these trees – along with those of parks and municipal lands – is absolutely critical to ensure the continued vitality of West Vancouver - one of the most desirable regions in the world. The iconic forests of the North Shore should be considered an irreplaceable jewel – and they need your protection. We strongly urge you to create the necessary protection laws, without delay. Otherwise these vitally
important species will be lost forever – *Preserve Now* – it is time to take account of what we have now – before we reach the point of no return.

It is difficult for us humans to see beyond the immediate future, or even 20 years from now. But we owe it to future generations – our youth and their children and their children’s children and so on – to take the role of ‘keepers’ of the lands and oceans; to preserve and protect the vitality of our oceans, coastlines, and forests, and steward them for future generations.

By this letter we urge you to promptly take the necessary strategic and immediate actions toward tree protection – at the policy-level, and shortly thereafter implement avenues for public education and community engagement. To maintain the status quo is not only unacceptable, it is irresponsible.

As residents of West Vancouver we feel passionate and profoundly privileged to live in the most spectacular region of the world. Please help us maintain and enhance the beauty of West Vancouver by showing the leadership necessary to address this serious issue. This is a critical time to think and act differently.

In closing, if there is a strong commitment on your part to address the serious issues of tree preservation in West Vancouver with the appropriate bylaw protection, we could provide some help with respect to education. To avoid making this letter too long, I have included some ideas as an appendix page attached to this letter on how this critical aspect may be achieved.

Sincerely,

West Vancouver Residents for Preservation of West Vancouver’s Vital Urban Forests

cc West Vancouver Officials
Nina Leemhuis, Chief Administrative Officer, nleemhuis@westvancouver.ca
Jim Bailey, Director, Planning & Development Services, jbailey@westvancouver.ca
Anne Mooi, Director, Parks & Community Services, amooi@westvancouver.ca
Sandra Bicigo, Manager, Environment and Sustainability, sbicigo@westvancouver.ca
Stephen Mikicich, Manager, Community Planning, smikicich@westvancouver.ca
Krista Braathen, District Arborist, Parks and Community Services, kbraathen@westvancouver.ca

cc West Vancouver Residents:

Attachments:
1) Appendix on Education of Public (Page 4 of this document)
2) PDF attachment of letter of April 21, 2014
Appendix on Education of the Public: Education could be facilitated by having a special subsection of the West Vancouver website devoted to urban forests so that the public can achieve some understanding of: a) the tremendous value of trees to the urban environment ('ecological services') and b) the present pressures on our trees related to climate change, building, and various other anthropogenic disturbances. 

Topics in lay language & illustrations on the website (or as distributed pamphlets) could include:

- How trees mitigate climate change by carbon sequestration and other processes
- How trees create habitat space – the world above and the world below ground – this could highlight the reasons why West Vancouver residents can enjoy viewing unique wildlife such as owls and pileated woodpeckers. It could also illustrate how healthy soils (and the microbes therein that keep soils healthy) play necessary roles in prolonging the life of trees and conversely how microbes, in turn, depend on trees for their own nutrition and survival.
- How geographic information system (GIS) technologies can tell us a lot about sustainability by showing us historical changes in tree cover in our urban setting. (There may be relevant data available presently for West Vancouver as satellite images, I think, are collected regularly)
- Complexity of tree communities (e.g. in our urban parks, as in old growth forests) that involve extensive tree-to-tree communication and the implications for harvest practices
- The tremendous cultural value of WV native tree species – especially yellow-cedar & red cedar
- How future climate changes will affect the ability of trees to establish, grow and set seed (tree regeneration). With warming and more frequent episodic drought, the negative influences on future regeneration of trees in urban environments are undeniable (i.e., it is not a question of harvest now, we can simply replace the trees later by re-planting)
- The natural defenses of trees against insect pests and pathogens, and climate-change-related factors that may alter the ability of trees to defend themselves
- The positive impacts of trees on human health – from medicinal compounds to calming volatiles, and lower crime rates in urban settings
- How trees clean the air from pollutants, aerosols, and noxious gases and improve the vitality of our beautiful West Vancouver beaches/oceans, and our urban streams/rivers
- How conservation programs will be important for reducing the environmental impacts of the combined effects of human disturbance and natural hazards
- $$ Harvest versus preservation of urban forest trees: Tree preservation offsets huge municipality costs linked to flooding of homes, storm water runoff, and increased heating and cooling expenses
- How our urban forests offer increased opportunities for food production as people develop resilient and food secure neighborhoods
- How trees on private properties improve property values – studies spearheaded by Nature Conservancy with the support of funds from TD Friends of the Environment

Besides improving the WV website, or distributing literature pamphlets, another tool that could be used by council to strengthen public support is to apply for funds from the West Vancouver Foundation to engage the community. You could advertise in the North Shore News for an individual with arboricultural skills to form a West Vancouver Treekeepers group, similar to the one in Vancouver, and one that has opportunities for youth involvement and leadership skills training. Once established, a West Vancouver Treekeepers could also contribute to a North Shore tree seed bank. The benefits of maintaining seed banks for various trees (food-bearing nut trees, hardwoods and conifers), would have several profound advantages, including encouraging in the public an understanding of food sustainability and the value of maintaining biodiversity of our native trees. WV citizens (whether long-term residents or new immigrants) need to develop a conservation ethic; participating in real-action initiatives, such as the above-noted activities would serve many positive outcomes.
Dear Mayor and Councillors of West Vancouver:

We live in the area of Sentinel Hill on (s.22(1)) and we are very concerned about the increased frequency of the cutting and/or removal of trees (including mature conifer trees) on private properties. We are alarmed and disappointed to learn about the lack of virtually any regulations surrounding this, and fear that even the greenway and trees of other "protected" areas are at risk in our neighborhood, and throughout West Vancouver.

Houses on Braeside Street and many residences throughout West Vancouver are under construction - the trend of demolishing houses and building new, much larger, "institute-style" residences is certainly on the upswing. Unfortunately a negative consequence of this trend is that the trees (both conifers and deciduous trees) are being taken down almost indiscriminately, with very little regard for their inherent value.

Other municipalities and other cities have rules in place to govern the removal/cutting of trees on private properties. We and several other West Vancouver residents would like to see regulations put in place for West Vancouver. It is certainly reasonable to view the trees as collectively belonging to West Vancouver, not to individuals. But even if this is a point of contention with residents, a short rationale follows in support of protecting our trees that includes a non-exhaustive list of some of the critical functions and characteristics of trees:

(1) Trees provide food, homes, and/or safe harbour for several hundreds of thousands of species. It is these rich resources that we enjoy as residents of West Vancouver. Do we really want this wonderful area and its associated wildlife to erode or vanish? The list of wildlife that relies upon trees includes a multitude of species of birds, including birds of prey (owls, eagles, and falcons), as well as mammals of variable size.

(2) Preservation of trees does not decrease property values, but rather improves both property values, and the desirability of the region. As mentioned above a common practice is the building of "institute-style" houses that challenge the boundaries of the property in which trees are a "casualty" and are typically removed before the building process has started. I challenge anyone to make a ratio of land value to house value, and find that the latter exceeds the former. Rather the reverse is the case. Another common misconception of owners is that tree destruction is acceptable when trees are replaced by the planting of gardens and shrubs; this simply shows the extent of ignorance of the public
surrounding the inherent value of trees. If West Vancouver continues on the alarming trend of tree removal that is apparent presently, the desirability and inherent value of the entire region will decline.

(3) **When you remove the trees, you remove the view:** Even the most casual observer with some reflection can readily see the sterility of neighborhoods that have emerged as a result of the developer or owner completely harvesting the surrounding trees. In West Vancouver there are several areas of this type of devastation associated with the removal of virtually all of the surrounding trees – a travesty in every sense. A recent article in the *Sun* (April, 2014) notes the changes in the landscape of Vancouver that have been generated by the removal of trees. The decline of neighborhoods previously enriched with trees is evident by several means, including use of the human eye (with brain), aerial photographic images, or by sophisticated remote sensing tools such as Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) technology and several other geospatial interface technologies. What further evidence is needed to protect the tremendous resources that are the gifts of Greater Vancouver, and in particular of West Vancouver?

(4) **“Windowing” and more extensive cutting leads to dead or structurally weakened trees:** In addition to tree removal, in other cases, the trees have been extensively “windowed”, and/or cut down to short trunks (photos available). Not only are the isolated trunks unsightly, but also they are either entirely incapable of re-shooting or if capable of regeneration, result in a tree that is highly vulnerable to the multitude of environmental stresses to which our trees are normally subjected (e.g. periodic drought, high winds). The cutting “down to the studs” of trees is a prime example of a multitude of cases in which a homeowner decision or joint owner-neighbor agreement has led to the demise of trees through these practices.

(5) **Tree growth and reproduction are time-intensive processes: History is lost upon tree harvest:** Most people recognize that tree growth is slow. For many conifer species, the process whereby trees reach the stage where they can reproduce and set seed is exceptionally lengthy. When a tree of considerable maturity (100+ years of growth) is harvested, a large history has been lost.

(6) **The removal of trees at higher elevations on the North Shore has led to several negative consequences associated with the erosion of natural habitats for birds and wildlife including large mammals:** This includes bears, which must now forage for food at the lower elevations (urban areas). There must be significant costs to West Vancouver to deal with these and related issues.

(7) **Trees help mitigate the negative effects of climate change – among other properties they sequester carbon and filter air pollutants.**

(8) **Trees are a major determinant of slope stability and positively influence soil properties to offset potential floods and erosion.** They can further shelter homes from strong winds and rain.
(9) **Trees are of tremendous cultural importance** (e.g. Sacred Cedar). A report of the pacific salmon forests project, *The Cultural and Archaeological Significance of Culturally Modified Trees* by Arnoud H. Stryd, Ph.D Vicki Feddema, M.A. published by David Suzuki Foundation. In addition, trees have developed the ability to produce an enormous number of 'secondary metabolites' in the course of evolution. These complex molecules are typically not required in the primary processes of tree growth and development but are of vital importance for their interaction with the environment, and for their reproductive strategies and defense mechanisms. Some of these molecules have been used or investigated for their medicinal properties in humans.

(10) **Our trees are relatively healthy, which is not the case in other BC locales:** We have extensive mortality of trees in the interior of BC (e.g. several pine and spruce species) and along our coastlines (e.g. yellow-cypress) due to a variety of stressors that include pathogens, insect pests and exposure to freezing stress during spring 'de-hardening' – stressors that have become more severe as a result of climate change. Yet owners are still intent on the widespread harvesting of healthy trees as if there were no tomorrow and with no responsibility for future generations.

(11) **A system to protect the trees of West Vancouver would not be precedent-setting:** Several other municipalities and Canadian cities have regulations in place regarding the cutting/removal of trees on private properties. Regulations are even more critical to put in place for West Vancouver neighborhoods, for which the gift of trees and all of the precious resources that they support is still evident, but is declining at an alarming rate.

In closing, as residents of West Vancouver we feel so very fortunate to enjoy the riches that the North Shore offers, and the trees are such an integral part of these riches.

**We urge you to take immediate action on this issue.**

Sincerely,

West Vancouver
Your Worship,

It seems that I misspoke yesterday evening during the public comments portion of the council meeting. I used the term "Net Zero Emissions" when the correct term to use is "Carbon Neutral".


According to the Climate Action Working Group (2010), “Local Government (Green Communities) Statutes Amendment Act”, Bill 27 (2008), “local governments are required to include targets, policies and actions for the reduction of GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions in their Official Community Plans (OCPs) by May 31, 2010.”

The District of West Vancouver Council complied with the requirements of Bill 27 (2008) by amending the Official Community Plan during 2010.

Policy Section A—Climate Action was added to the OCP. In that policy section, at page 31.1, the following passage is found:

“With respect to municipal operations, the District of West Vancouver has signed on to the BC Climate Action Charter. As a signatory, the District is committed to achieving carbon neutral operations.”

According to the OCP, “the District will need to:

“a) examine the energy consumption and energy efficiency of its buildings and other municipally-owned facilities to look for opportunities to reduce consumption and improve efficiency;
“b) re-examine its vehicle fleet and take steps to replace older vehicles with more fuel-efficient options; and
“c) examine options for staff transportation demand management, local purchasing policies, and other emissions reduction policies.”

Also in Policy Section A—Climate Action at page 31.2, the OCP sets forth the following targets, “The Targets”,

“The District of West Vancouver:

• commits to becoming carbon neutral with respect to municipal operations by 2012; and
• commits to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by at least 33% below 2007 levels by 2020 and at least 80% below 2007 levels by 2050”

The OCP goes on to state,

“These bold and visionary targets support West Vancouver’s vision to ‘inspire excellence and lead by example’.”

So there you have it, your Worship. Carbon neutrality to be achieved by 2012 for District operations. Greenhouse gas emissions to be 33% below 2007 levels by 2020, and to be 80% below 2007 levels by 2050. Those are the targets, as set forth in the Official Community Plan. Ambitious, challenging, and like the target to achieve carbon neutrality by 2012 in District operations only to be observed in the breach.

Nonetheless, those are the targets as they stand now. You and your councillors can amend the OCP through a bylaw which should be informed by considered reflection on the attainability and practicality of the stated targets. It’s not
a ridiculous idea, amending the OCP, to bring the targets into line with what can realistically be achieved with the limited means at hand so that we don’t end up looking ridiculous for having set targets that we can’t possibly meet on any reasonable basis in fact. That’s for you to decide, in your wisdom.

In the meantime, the present OCP dictates that municipal operations be carbon neutral and the emissions of greenhouse gases be reduced by 33% from 2007 levels by 2020. The year 2020 now falls within the five-year financial plan, and as such, the five-year financial plan must take into account the impact of attaining those stipulated targets on the financial condition of the municipality going forward. How that will be achieved is left for your professional accountants and managers to determine. But it must be done and the five-year financial plan must reflect that starting from 2016.

Now, there are a variety of means of budgeting for this activity, one of which is to show the expenditures and revenues in a separate section of the budget documents and the audited financial statements to ensure accountability and transparency. Achievement of carbon neutral operations is conveniently done by purchasing carbon-offsets from the provincial government (if that programme is still available), or failing the provincial government by purchasing suitable carbon-offsets from certified third-party providers acceptable to the provincial authorities.

Obtaining a 33% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the 97% that is produced by the community presents a significant challenge without legislative tools (legal coercion) to bully residents and businesses into compliance with the target. Hence, a programme of persuasion is likely the only course open to you, and that will entail expenditure for communication materials, personnel, contractors, etc. The closer we come to the year 2020, the more expensive such a programme will become. From a practical perspective, the chances of success are low but hopefully not negligible. It’s up to you to decide how and when to proceed, but the financial plan should clearly show the level of effort and the dollar amounts to be committed year by year and the departments tasked with the responsibility for the programme.

I trust your good sense and look forward to seeing the resulting programme set out in this year’s five-year financial plan.

Yours sincerely,

West Vancouver, BC
January 11, 2016

Dear Union of B.C. Municipalities and Local Governments:

Re: Discussion of the Emergency Program Act


This document is intended to support an online consultation and engagement with British Columbians through a dialogue about the current Emergency Program Act (the Act), which sets out the key responsibilities and authorities to guide and enable experts at the local and provincial levels in preparing for, responding to and recovering from emergencies and disasters.

It is our intention to review the Act to ensure that it provides a solid legal foundation to meet whatever challenges that may come our way here in this province, be they small scale emergencies contained at the local level or catastrophic events affecting a region or even possibly the entire province.

The Act was first introduced in 1993 and has undergone few changes since. While legislation may not be top of mind when we think about being prepared for an emergency or disaster, it is the key source of responsibilities and authorities required to empower elected officials and emergency management personnel to take the right actions at the right time.

Prepared and Resilient describes challenges in the current legislation as well as proposals for possible changes. The challenges and proposals reflect recent changes some Canadian jurisdictions have made to modernize their emergency management laws, as well as the findings and recommendations of two recent reports here in B.C.—the 2014 earthquake preparedness reports of the Auditor General and Henry Renteria.

The input we receive from you and other stakeholders through this consultation will be a key component to informing our government’s review of the Act and, ultimately, any decision to move forward with the introduction of possible legislative changes.
The consultation period begins on January 11, 2016, with the release of the paper, and will continue until February 19, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. Please submit your formal responses to citizenengagement@gov.bc.ca before the end of the consultation period.

In order to promote that transparency of this review, any submission from your organization, or other stakeholders who have been invited to participate, may be posted on http://engage.gov.bc.ca/emergencyprogranact/ The web site contains a list of all stakeholders who have received invitations to participate. Please include the name of your organization in your submission. To protect your privacy or the privacy of any other members of your organization, please do not include your personal phone number or e-mail address in your submission.

Emergency management is fundamentally about partnerships. We must all continue to work together to ensure a prepared and resilient B.C. I am therefore looking forward to hearing the feedback and thoughts you and the members of your organization may have for possible improvements to the legislative framework for emergency management in B.C.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Naomi Yamamoto
Minister of State
Prepared and Resilient

A discussion paper on the legislative framework for emergency management in British Columbia

JANUARY 2016
Contents

Message from the Minister ................................................................. 1
Executive Summary ........................................................................ 2
Context of a Review of the Emergency Program Act .................. 3
Challenges and Proposals ................................................................. 5
  Discussion Area A: Modernizing fundamental concepts and structure of the Act .................................................. 5
    Discussion 1: The phases of emergency management .......................................................... 5
    Discussion 2: Definition of "emergency" ........................................................................... 6
    Discussion 3: Definition of "local authority" ...................................................................... 8
  Discussion Area B: Clarifying rules and responsibilities ......................... 9
    Discussion 4: Emergency Management BC ................................................................. 9
    Discussion 5: Assigning provincial emergency planning, response, and recovery responsibilities 10
    Discussion 6: Ministerial authority to direct emergency planning ................................ 12
    Discussion 7: Private sector and non-government agencies ........................................ 13
  Discussion Area C: Supporting emergency response and recovery .......... 15
    Discussion 8: Shared responsibility for emergency response .................................... 15
    Discussion 9: State of emergency ............................................................................... 17
    Discussion 10: Evacuation orders ............................................................................... 18
    Discussion 11: Employment protection ...................................................................... 20
Conclusion ..................................................................................... 21
Message from the Minister

As Minister of State for Emergency Preparedness, I am pleased to announce the release of Prepared and Resilient: A Discussion Paper on the Legislative Framework for Emergency Management in British Columbia. This document is intended to support a consultation that will engage stakeholders in a dialogue about emergency management legislation in British Columbia.

When we think about being prepared for an emergency or disaster I think it is fair to say that legislation is not top of mind. Nevertheless, we must recognize that the coordination and synergies of emergency management experts in this province—whether at the local or provincial level—starts with understanding and fulfilling key emergency management responsibilities and having the appropriate authority to take the right actions at the right time when faced with an emergency or disaster. That's where legislation comes in: to establish the legal framework for a prepared and resilient British Columbia.

The Emergency Program Act is the key piece of legislation for emergency management in British Columbia. The Act, which was introduced in 1993, sets out roles and responsibilities for local authorities and the provincial government in preparing, responding to and recovering from emergencies and disasters. The Act also sets out the authority for local government or the province to declare a state of emergency and to use emergency powers to protect the health, safety or welfare of people and to limit damage to property.

A key challenge with the Act and its regulations—and a principal reason for this consultation and engagement—is that while best practices in the field of emergency management in B.C. and elsewhere have evolved significantly over the past two decades, the Emergency Program Act has remained largely unchanged since its introduction and has never been the subject of a full and open review as proposed herein. The time has therefore come for us to examine the Act to ensure it provides the solid legal foundation we need here in B.C. to meet whatever challenges may come our way, be they small scale emergencies contained at the local level or catastrophic events affecting a region or even possibly the entire province.

This consultation acknowledges recent changes some other Canadian jurisdictions have made to modernize their emergency management laws. The engagement has also been shaped by findings and recommendations of the 2014 earthquake preparedness reports of the Auditor General and Henry Renteria, the former head of California's Office of Emergency Services who consulted with stakeholders on earthquake preparedness issues and priorities.

Ultimately, though, it is the input and feedback that we receive from interested British Columbians on the challenges and proposals outlined herein that will best inform the development of any changes to the law. It is my hope that this consultation will engage British Columbians in a dialogue so that together we can create legislation that supports a prepared and resilient B.C.

Sincerely,

Honourable Naomi Yamamoto
Minister of State for Emergency Preparedness
Executive Summary

The Premier’s mandate letter to Minister of State for Emergency Preparedness Naomi Yamamoto directs the
Minister to lead a review of the Emergency Program Act (Act) to ensure the legislation is up to date and effective
in managing the impacts of emergencies in British Columbia, providing a report back to Cabinet Committee on
Secure Tomorrow on or before March 31, 2016.

This engagement is intended to be a key component of the review of the legislation. It highlights several key
challenges in the Act and seeks input from stakeholders on proposals for possible legislative changes so that
government may better understand what improvements if any may be needed to ensure the Act is up to date
and effective.

The specific examples of challenges presented in this consultation fall into one of the following three
discussion areas, with each including proposals for possible changes to the Act for consideration and input
of stakeholders:

A. Modernizing fundamental concepts and structure of the Act:
   1. Phases of emergency management (prevention, preparedness, response and recovery);
   2. Definition of emergency and disaster; and
   3. Definition of local authority.

B. Clarifying roles and responsibilities:
   4. Emergency Management BC;
   5. Provincial emergency planning, response and recovery responsibilities;
   6. Ministerial authority to direct emergency planning; and
   7. Provincial authority for private sector and non-government agencies.

C. Supporting emergency response and recovery:
   8. Shared responsibilities for emergency response;
   9. State of Emergency;
   10. Evacuation orders; and

Stakeholder input on the identified challenges and discussion questions may be submitted to
citizenengagement@gov.bc.ca by Feb. 19, 2016. In order to promote the transparency of the review and
engagement process, submissions received from stakeholders who Minister Yamamoto invited to provide
input may be posted to Emergency Management BC's website. Submissions from members of the public
posted to the website forum will be reviewed and incorporated into the review process along with the other
stakeholder submissions.
Context of a Review of the Emergency Program Act

OVERVIEW OF THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

The Emergency Program Act provides the legislative framework for the management of disasters and emergencies within British Columbia. This framework defines responsibilities of local authorities, provincial ministries and crown corporations along with the responsibility for the Province’s emergency management program. It requires local authorities, ministries, crown corporations, and government agencies to develop plans and programs to prepare and respond to emergencies and disasters in the Province. It also provides local authorities, the Minister responsible for the Act, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council, with the ability to declare a state of emergency in order to access the extraordinary powers required to co-ordinate emergency responses.

Supporting the Emergency Program Act are three regulations made under the authority of the statute:

- Emergency Program Management Regulation identifies duties and responsibilities of provincial ministries and government corporations in relation to specific hazards and generally in the event of an emergency;
- Local Authority Emergency Management Regulation outlines roles and responsibilities of Local Authorities; and
- Compensation and Disaster Financial Assistance Regulation establishes the framework for the provisions of disaster financial assistance.

WHY REVIEW THE ACT?

The time is ripe to review the Emergency Program Act to ensure it is effective in supporting the management of emergencies in British Columbia. The current iteration of the Emergency Program Act dates back to 1993 and has been subject to a small number of limited amendments since then. Over the last two decades various events and operational responses have prompted the provincial government and other partners in emergency management to consider and revise operational practices and procedures.

A further factor contributing factor are the 2014 reports of the Office of the Auditor General and Henry Renteria on earthquake preparedness. These reports further highlighted where changes may be necessary to improve the preparedness of British Columbians in relation to the possible occurrence of a catastrophic event.

Finally, the Premier’s July 30, 2015 mandate letter to Minister Yamamoto directs the Minister to lead a review of the Act to ensure the legislation is up to date and effective in managing the impacts of emergencies in British Columbia and reporting back to Cabinet Committee on Secure Tomorrow on or before March 31, 2016. This consultation is intended as a key step in achieving a review as envisioned in the mandate letter by engaging stakeholders in a discussion about what improvements if any may be needed to ensure the Act is up to date and effective.
SCOPE OF REVIEW

This engagement identifies 3 main challenges in the Act and broken out into the following discussion areas:

A. Modernizing fundamental concepts and structure of the Act

B. Clarifying roles and responsibilities

C. Supporting emergency response and recovery

The list of challenges and examples presented for discussion and consideration are focused on the Act and not the regulations. However, this does not preclude comments and input on any of the regulations as potential changes to the Act could also have implications for matters set out under the regulations.

Finally, the discussions presented here are not intended to be an exhaustive list. It is hoped that the items raised here will generate thought and discussion that will result in a broad range of items for government to consider.

OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS

Minister Yamamoto sent letters to key stakeholders on the release date of this engagement to invite them to provide submissions on the challenges and proposals outlined herein. In order to promote the transparency of the review and engagement process, submissions received from stakeholders who received invitations may be posted to Emergency Management BC's website. A list of these stakeholders is also provided on the website.

Other interested stakeholders, including members of the public, may also make submissions. Any submissions received from individuals or organizations who did not receive invitation letters from Minister Yamamoto will also be reviewed and incorporated into the review process; these submissions will be collected via the EMBC website forum.

Submissions will be received up to Feb. 19, 2016, at 4 p.m. At the closing of the consultation period, all submissions will be reviewed and analyzed for themes and suggestions that can be compiled and presented by Minister Yamamoto to the Cabinet Committee on Secure Tomorrow on or before March 31, 2016, in accordance with the Minister’s mandate letter.
Challenges and Proposals

Discussion Area A: Modernizing fundamental concepts and structure of the Act

Discussion 1: The phases of emergency management

Background:

Emergency management is a universal term for the systems and processes used for preventing or reducing the impacts of disasters on communities. Emergency management is conceptualized in four phases: prevention/mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery.

This phased approach is an internationally recognized standard for defining and understanding different aspects of emergency management and is integral to the systems and processes in BC that local authorities and government use to minimize vulnerability to hazards and for coping with disasters. For example, over the last two decades local authority and government emergency plans, which are a central feature of the Emergency Program Act, have come to be understood as plans related to preparedness for, prevention and mitigation of, response to and recovery from an emergency and its effects.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:

While the Emergency Program Act references aspects of the phased approach to emergency management, it is important that the terms prevention, preparedness, response and recovery are used consistently throughout the legislation. Consideration should be given to structuring the Act to reflect the distinct subject matter of the phases whereby separate parts are established for each phase, with powers and duties for local authorities and the provincial government set out in each part.

The Act’s current name should also better reflect the emergency management focus of the act. The current name reflects the role of the Provincial Emergency Program, which has been superseded by Emergency Management BC. See Discussion Area B, Discussion 4. As well, “emergency program” is not defined and, while the term “program” is used in numerous sections in the Act, it may be unclear in some sections as to what this term means in relation to the phases of emergency management.

A further consideration is the definition of “local authority emergency plan” and “provincial emergency plan”. These definitions do not currently emphasize that emergency planning involves all phases of emergency management.

Relevant sections in the legislation:

- Title of the Act
- Part 1—Definitions and Application
- Part 2—Administration
- Part 3—Emergencies, Disasters and Declared Emergencies
Proposal:
Consideration should be given to the following potential changes to the Act:

2. Restructuring the Act so that it contains parts reflecting the phases of emergency management (i.e. a part dedicated to preparedness, a part dedicated to response etc.)
3. Removing the term "emergency program" and references to "program" or "programs" throughout.
4. Defining an "emergency plan" as a plan under the Act to prepare for, prevent, mitigate against, respond to and recover from an emergency and its effects.

Discussion 2:
Definition of "emergency"

Background:
A definition of an "emergency" is essential to emergency management legislation. In the Emergency Program Act, the term "emergency" gives meaning to other important concepts such as emergency plans, emergency programs, emergency measures, and states of emergency.

The current definition of emergency in the Act provides that it is a "present or imminent event or circumstance that is caused by accident, fire, explosion, technical failure or the forces of nature ...". A "disaster", on the other hand, is a subset of an emergency. The Act defines a disaster as a calamity that is caused by accident, fire, explosion or technical failure or by the forces of nature and has resulted in serious harm to people or widespread damage to property.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
BC's legislation limits the definition of an emergency to a specific set of causes, which raises a question as to whether some events or circumstances may fall outside the scope of the Act. Similar legislation in other provincial jurisdictions generally uses broader language that puts an emphasis on defining an emergency based on what could or does result from an event, situation, or condition. Many other jurisdictions have also included damage to the environment in the definition of emergency.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Section 1 of the Emergency Program Act
Proposal:

1. Consider removing the potential causes in the definition of ‘emergency’ and clarify that an emergency includes a disaster. The following definitions from other Canadian jurisdictions may be a helpful guide in revising the definition of ‘emergency’ in BC:
   • Manitoba’s Emergency Measures Act defines ‘emergency’ as follows:
     “a present or imminent situation or condition that requires prompt action to prevent or limit (a) the loss of life; or (b) harm or damage to the safety, health or welfare of people; or (c) damage to property or the environment”
   • Alberta’s Emergency Management Act defines ‘emergency’ as follows:
     “an event that requires prompt co-ordination of action or special regulation of persons or property to protect the safety, health or welfare of people or to limit damage to property”
   • Ontario’s Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act defines emergency as follows:
     “a situation or an impending situation that constitutes a danger of major proportions that could result in serious harm to persons or substantial damage to property and that is caused by the forces of nature, a disease or other health risk, an accident or an act whether intentional or otherwise”

2. Consider including damage to the environment in the definition of emergency.

Additional information for consideration:

Discussion 3:
Definition of “local authority”

Background:
Four treaties have been ratified to date under the BC Treaty Process with the Maa-Nulth First Nations, Tsawwassen First Nation, Tla’amin Nation, and Yale First Nation. In addition, a treaty was implemented outside of the treaty process with the Nisga’a in 2000.

All of the modern treaties implemented or ratified provide that Treaty First Nations and the Nisga’a Lisims Government have the “rights, powers, duties and obligations of a local authority under federal and provincial law in respect of emergency preparedness and emergency measures” on Treaty Lands. This includes specific law making authority in relation to emergency preparedness and emergency measures, as well as authority to declare a state of local emergency and exercise the powers of a local authority in accordance with federal and provincial laws in respect of emergency measures.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
The Emergency Program Act defines a ‘local authority’ as one of the following:
- A municipality
- Regional district
- National park subject to an agreement between the province and the government of Canada

The definition does not currently include Treaty First Nations or the Nisga’a Lisims Government. As the Treaty First Nations have the status of local authorities for the purposes of the Emergency Program Act, consideration needs to be given to modernizing the definition of ‘local authority’ in the Act to ensure proper alignment with the provisions of the treaties. This change will further reinforce the continued coordination of activities and shared responsibilities between the provincial government, Treaty First Nation governments, local governments, and other institutions to work together to mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Sections 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19 of the Emergency Program Act
- Local Authority Emergency Management Regulation
- Compensation and Disaster Financial Assistance Regulation

Proposal:
1. Consider changing the definition of ‘local authority’ to include Treaty First Nations, including the Nisga’a Lisims Government.
   - Consider the impact of this proposal in relation to all provisions in the Act that are applied to local authorities.
   - This proposal is subject to provincial government consultation with the Treaty First Nations and the Nisga’a Lisims Government in accordance with treaty obligations.

Additional information for consideration:
BC Treaties:
Discussion Area B:  
Clarifying roles and responsibilities

Discussion 4:  
Emergency Management BC

Background:
Emergency management requires cross-agency, cross-government and inter-jurisdictional coordination and integration to ensure effective delivery of emergency management services.

Emergency Management British Columbia (EMBC) was established in 2006 to take on the responsibilities of its predecessor, the Provincial Emergency Program (PEP), and to take on the role as the lead coordinating agency in the provincial government for all emergency management activities.

EMBC provides executive coordination, strategic planning, and multi-agency facilitation and strives to develop effective working relationships in an increasingly complex emergency management environment. EMBC works with local governments, First Nations, federal departments, industry, non-government organizations and volunteers to support the emergency management phases of mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Additionally, EMBC engages provincial, national and international partners to enhance collective emergency preparedness.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
The Emergency Program Act does not currently reference Emergency Management BC. Instead, the Act continues to reference the Provincial Emergency Program.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Section 2 of the Emergency Program Act
- Section 2 of the Emergency Program Management Regulation

Proposal:
1. Establish Emergency Management BC in legislation and remove references to the Provincial Emergency Program.

2. Clarify the responsibilities of the director of EMBC to include the following:
   - Lead the coordination of all provincial government emergency management activities,
   - Provide advice and assistance to other authorities—provincial and local authorities—in their emergency management responsibilities,
   - Establish and maintain a provincial emergency management system to standardize provincial emergency response activities, and
   - Reduce risk by promoting and supporting emergency preparedness, prevention and mitigation, response and recovery initiatives.

Additional information for consideration:
- EMBC website:  
  http://www.embc.gov.bc.ca/index.htm
- EMBC's strategic plan:  
Discussion 5:
Assigning provincial emergency planning, response, and recovery responsibilities

Background:
Under section 4(1) of the Emergency Program Act, the Minister responsible for the Act is required to prepare provincial emergency plans respecting preparation for, response to and recovery from emergencies and disasters.

The Act also provides authority under section 28(2) (a) for the Lieutenant Governor in Council (LGIC) to assign responsibilities to ministries, boards, commissions or government corporations or agencies for the preparation and implementation of emergency plans, including arrangements to deal with emergencies and disasters.

The Emergency Program Management Regulation contains requirements for ministers and government corporations to develop emergency plans. The responsibility for ministers to make provincial emergency plans for specific hazards is assigned in Schedule 1 of the Regulation. Schedule 2 of the regulation sets out duties of ministers and government corporations in the event of an emergency.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
The Ministerial responsibility under the Act for preparing provincial emergency plans and the LGIC authority to assign responsibility for provincial emergency plans requires clarification. The Minister responsible for the Act does not prepare all provincial emergency plans respecting preparation for, response to and recovery from emergencies and disasters. This responsibility is distributed across government ministries and agencies, a process that is more accurately reflected in schedule 1 of the EPM Regulation.

However, the feasibility of assigning emergency planning and other duties by way of regulation is questionable. Emergency management practices have evolved considerably over the last two decades and will continue to do so. The process of updating and changing provincial emergency responsibilities through amendments to a regulation can be cumbersome and not well suited to responding to changes in the dynamic emergency management environment.

A further matter in the context of provincial emergency management responsibilities is the extent to which the legislative framework should capture public organizations such as school boards and health authorities, which do not fall under the definition of Government Corporation. Henry Renteria acknowledged concerns of many stakeholders respecting emergency management plans and capacities across specific sectors (p. 19). While other public bodies with various degrees of independence from government engage with government ministries in emergency planning processes, the question of government’s responsibility to ensure coordination of planning, response and recovery duties when and where necessary should be considered.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Sections 4 and 28 of the Emergency Program Act
- See the Emergency Program Management Regulation
Proposal:

1. Consider removing the current scheme from the Act whereby the Lieutenant Governor in Council (LGIC) assigns emergency planning, response and recovery duties by regulation and provide for the following in the Act:
   - An authority for the minister responsible for the Act to require other ministers, after consulting with them, to prepare emergency plans in relation to specified hazards.
   - An authority for the Minister responsible for the Act to require, after consultation, that a minister, government corporation, or other prescribed public bodies prepare emergency plans in relation to carrying out specific emergency response and recovery duties.

2. In order to support the proposed changes outlined above, other amendments would be required, including the following:
   - Define 'hazard' as something that may cause, or contribute substantially to the cause of, an emergency.
   - Move the existing requirements in section 3 of the Emergency Program Management Regulation respecting emergency planning to the Act.
   - Provide an LGIC regulation creating the authority to prescribe public bodies for the purposes of the Act.

Additional information for consideration:

- Henry Renteria's 2014 report on B.C. Earthquake Preparedness:
Discussion 6: Ministerial authority to direct emergency planning

Background:
Effective emergency planning is essential to emergency management. In B.C., local governments lead the initial response to emergencies and disasters in their communities and, as required under the Act, they prepare emergency plans and maintain an emergency management organization to ensure the safety of citizens when a situation escalates beyond the first responder level.

Under section 4(b)(f) of the Act, the Minister has the authority to review and recommend changes to a local emergency plan. Currently, Emergency Management BC works with its partners in local governments to provide advice and guidance on the development of local emergency plans.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
While the Minister has authority under the Act to review and recommend changes to a local emergency plan, the minister does not have authority to require that a local authority make changes to their plans in situations where a cooperative approach has not been productive to address a significant issue with a plan.

Most other jurisdictions in Canada provide the Minister responsible with authority to review and, if necessary, require changes to emergency plans. Manitoba has a clear and comprehensive scheme under section 8 of that province’s Act for the Minister to require revisions to local authority emergency plans as well as those across the provincial government. Ontario’s Act provides authority for the Minister to set standards for plans under section 14 of that province’s Act. Section 9 of Alberta’s Act provides that the Minister responsible may “review and approve or require the modification of provincial and emergency plans and programs”.

Henry Renteria referenced the expectation many stakeholders in British Columbia have with respect to provincial government leadership in setting standards respecting emergency plans and programs. Specifically, he stated that Emergency Management BC must “provide more clarity regarding the expectations of local authorities in the area of emergency management” in support of his recommendation that EMBC’s authority be augmented to set minimum standards for emergency management programs.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Section 4 of the Emergency Program Act
Proposal:

1. Consider the addition of authority to provide that the Minister responsible for the Act may make an order requiring a local authority to change its local emergency plan where the minister has reviewed the plan and recommended modifications.

   - The authority should only be available to the Minister after the Minister has recommended modifications to an emergency plan and this authority should parallel the authority of the Minister to require revisions/changes to provincial emergency plans established by other ministries, government corporations and other agencies.

Additional information for consideration:


Discussion 7:
Private sector and non-government agencies

Background:

It is vital that critical infrastructure function through an emergency—a community's ability to respond and recover from a disaster requires restoration of and access to water, food, electricity, communications and other critical infrastructure.

In his 2014 British Columbia Earthquake Preparedness: Consultation Report, Henry Renteria wrote that entities such as private sector organizations and NGOs have a responsibility to those that depend on their services, particularly those organizations that provide critical goods and services, which, if disrupted or destroyed, would have a serious impact on the health, safety, security or economic well-being of citizens.

While Renteria's report acknowledges the efforts to date of Emergency Management BC to work with critical infrastructure (CI) partners through the establishment of a cross sector CI Steering Committee, he recommended the following key action to enhance the engagement of private sector and non-government organizations in emergency management as well support province-wide risk analysis:

"As a backdrop to voluntary engagement, the provincial and federal government must mandate appropriate private sector preparedness, including sharing of CI information and engagement in joint planning with emergency management organizations" (p. 28).

Private sector and non-governmental emergency management responsibilities is an emergent topic in other provincial jurisdictions. For example, in 2013, Manitoba introduced changes to its Emergency Measures Act to require private sector critical service
providers to prepare business continuity plans, as well as authority for the minister responsible to order these providers to take required measures during a state of emergency, including the implementation of any part of a business continuity plan.

**Challenge in the current legislative framework:**

In BC, the *Emergency Program Act* provides some specific powers during a state of emergency to local authorities and government in relation to the restoration of essential facilities and the distribution of essential supplies.

However, the Act does not set out responsibilities of private sector and non-government organizations respecting planning for and the prevention/mitigation of emergencies, nor any requirements for owners of critical infrastructure assets to provide information about their assets or their emergency plans regarding those assets.

**Relevant sections in the legislation:**

- Sections 5, 10 and 13 of the *Emergency Program Act*

**Proposal:**

1. Consider changes to the *Emergency Program Act* similar to Manitoba’s to define “critical services” and require providers of these services to undertake business continuity planning as prescribed by regulation.

- Manitoba’s Act requires that critical service providers submit business continuity plans to the co-ordinator of the province’s Emergency Measures Organization for review and approval.

2. Consider an authority to require owners of critical infrastructure assets to provide information about these assets as prescribed by regulation for the purposes of supporting efficient and effective emergency planning, prevention/mitigation, response and recovery.

- Any change to the legislation in this regard would need to be supported by a definition of “critical infrastructure assets”; outline how such information would be provided; and provide for the confidentiality of the information.

- Henry Renteria referred to “critical infrastructure” as “those physical and information technology facilities, networks, services and assets, which, if disrupted or destroyed, would have a serious impact on the health, safety, security, or economic well-being of Canadians or the effective functioning of governments in Canada” (p. 26).

**Additional information for consideration:**


Discussion Area C:  
Supporting emergency response and recovery

Discussion 8:  
Shared responsibility for emergency response

Background:
The Emergency Program Act provides that local authorities and the provincial government are to prepare emergency plans and implement them when “an emergency exists or appears imminent or a disaster has occurred or threatens.”

Section 7 of the Act provides that the Minister or designated person in a provincial emergency plan may cause the plan to be implemented if, in the opinion of the Minister or the designated person, an emergency exists or appears imminent. Section 8 provides that a local authority or a person designated in the local authority’s local emergency plan may cause the plan to be implemented if, in the opinion of the local authority or the designated person, an emergency exists or appears to exist.

The Emergency Program Management Regulation sets out that provincial emergency plans may include plans and procedures to assist local authorities with response and recovery from emergencies that “are of such magnitude that the local authorities are incapable of effectively responding to and recovering from them.”

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
A key aspect of emergency management is the sharing of responsibilities between local authorities and the province. In general, provincial government policy is that a local authority is responsible for planning for and responding to any emergency in its jurisdictional area with local resources and resources available to them through mutual aid/assistance agreements. This approach acknowledges that a local authority’s knowledge about its community—its people, history, risks, vulnerabilities, operational requirements and services—is critical to planning for, responding to and recovering from emergencies.

The province provides advice and support to the local authority responding to an emergency. Where the scope of an emergency exceeds a local authority’s resources, the province coordinates the provision of provincial resources to assist the local authority. In some cases, the provincial government has statutory obligations with respect to emergencies. For example, when it comes to wildfires under the Wildfire Act that do not affect developed areas, the provincial government responds, not local authorities.

While this ‘shared responsibility’ framework to emergency response is generally understood and accepted by stakeholders, it is not reflected in the Act. One consequence of this, in combination with the current scheme in the legislative framework for assigning provincial emergency responsibilities, is that from time to time confusion may result as to whether a local authority or the province should be implementing emergency plans in certain circumstances. Such confusion can undermine the coordinated and collaborative approaches essential for effective emergency management.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Sections 7 and 8 of the Emergency Program Act
- Section 3 of the Emergency Program Management Regulation
Proposal:

1. Consider the addition of provisions in the Act that set out the following in respect of local authorities:
   - Establish that a local authority is responsible for:
     - Assessing the threat to health, safety, or welfare of people or damage to property and the environment posed by an emergency;
     - Assessing the resources required to respond to and recover from the emergency, and
     - Implementing its local emergency plan and using local authority resources to respond to and recover from the emergency.
   - Provide that a local authority may implement one or more provisions of its local emergency plan in relation to responding to and recovering from an emergency if:
     - If the local authority is of the opinion that an emergency exists or is imminent in the local authority’s jurisdictional area; the local authority has declared a state of emergency; or a provincial state of emergency has been declared.

2. Consider the addition of provisions in the Act that set out the following in respect of the provincial government:
   - A Minister (or designate) is responsible for implementing one or more provisions of the Minister’s provincial emergency plan to provide provincial assistance and support to a local authority’s response to and recovery from an emergency if the following occur:
     - The scale of the emergency exceeds the response and recovery resources of the local authority and/or
     - The Minister is required under provincial law to provide provincial resources for emergency response and recovery.
   - Emergency Management BC is responsible for:
     - Communicating with a local authority in relation to an emergency within the jurisdictional area of the local authority, which includes:
       - Monitoring the needs of a local authority in responding to and recovering from emergencies;
       - Providing advice when necessary to local authorities responding to and recovering from emergencies; and
       - Communicating and providing advice when necessary to a Minister in relation to an emergency in the jurisdictional area of a local authority.
Discussion 9: State of emergency

Background:
The *Emergency Program Act* authorizes both local authorities and the province to declare a state of emergency. Once a state of emergency is declared, the level of government making the declaration may do “all acts and implement all procedures” that it considers necessary to prevent, respond to or alleviate the effects of an emergency or disaster, including one or more of the following:

- Acquire or use any land or personal property considered necessary;
- Authorize or require any person to render assistance of type the person is qualified to provide or that otherwise is or may be required;
- Authorize the entry into any building or on any land, without warrant;
- Cause the demolition or removal of any trees, structures or crops if the demolition or removal is considered necessary; and
- Procure, fix prices for or ration food, clothing, fuel, equipment, medical supplies, or other essential supplies.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
The authority for a local government or the province to undertake “all acts and implement all procedures” it considers necessary to address an emergency or disaster is a very broad and sweeping power. While legislation in most other Canadian jurisdictions provides a similar approach to the declaration of emergencies and the exercise of emergency powers as BC’s Act, Ontario’s Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act notably establishes criteria to guide when a state of emergency should be declared, as well as criteria for the making of orders during declared emergencies.

The emergency powers in the *Emergency Program Act* are generally consistent with those powers provided in similar legislation in other Canadian jurisdictions; however, some jurisdictions have recently included additional powers. Ontario’s legislation provides authority to require a person to collect, use or disclose information and this authority is contingent on the information collected only being used for the purpose of preventing, responding to or alleviating the effects of an emergency. Other BC legislation aimed at addressing specific emergency situations, such as the Public Health Act, also contains a similar general emergency power to collect, use and disclose information.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Sections 9 to 15 of the *Emergency Program Act*

Proposal:
1. Consider the addition of criteria or a test to guide local authorities or the provincial government in the declaration of a state of emergency and the making of orders during a declared emergency.

   - For example, criteria could include that a head of a local authority or the Minister responsible for the Act must believe that the declaration of a state of emergency is required because the use of one or more emergency powers under the Act is necessary and essential to protect the health, safety or welfare of persons or to limit damage to property.
2. Consider the addition of emergency powers not currently provided under section 10 of the Emergency Program Act. Some additional emergency powers that should be considered are as follows:

- Authority to collect, use or disclose information during a state of emergency that could not otherwise be collected, used or disclosed under any enactment.
  - Consideration must be given to including limits on any additional power respecting the collection, use and disclosure of information during an emergency. For example, in Ontario the information must only be collected, used or disclosed for the purpose of preventing, responding to or alleviating the effects of an emergency and for no other purpose.
- Authority to fast track the accreditation of medical or other essential personnel from other Canadian jurisdictions who may arrive to provide assistance during a state of emergency.
- A further potential emergency power to be considered is the authority for a local authority or the province to vary a licence, permit or other authorization the local authority or province, as applicable, has issued under an enactment.

Discussion 10:
Evacuation orders

Background:
The current Act provides authority for local authorities or the government to declare a state of emergency. A 'state of emergency', once declared, authorizes the local or authority or the Minister to undertake acts and procedures to prevent, respond to or alleviate the effects of an emergency or a disaster, which includes ordering the evacuation of persons from an area that may be affected by the emergency or disaster.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
While the Act provides authority for local governments or the Minister to make an evacuation order and "cause the evacuation" of people from an affected area, it says little of anything about how such an order is to be understood and carried out to ensure people are out of harm’s way. There is currently no authority under the Act or in other legislation to compel competent adults to leave their private property after an evacuation order is made—emergency responders warn people of the imminent risks of remaining in an area subject to evacuation, but ultimately rely on people to voluntary evacuate.

While leaving one’s property in a very short period of time leading up to or following an emergency or disaster is extremely difficult to do, it is important to understand that an individual’s decision not to heed an evacuation order can have serious implications not only for themselves, but also other people in the affected area. There have been numerous instances in Canadian jurisdictions and elsewhere where persons who refuse to evacuate require subsequent rescue, creating additional and unnecessary risk to themselves and emergency response personnel,
who are extremely burdened in times of crisis providing round-the-clock assistance to ensure the safety of the public.

The issue of enforcing evacuation orders has emerged as a recent topic of discussion in numerous Canadian jurisdictions. Manitoba became the first jurisdiction in Canada to address the issue in legislation, with amendments to its *Emergency Measures Act* in 2013. The changes provide authority to the police to apprehend any person who refuses to comply with an evacuation order issued under a declared state of emergency for the purpose of taking the person to a place of safety, as well as an ability to recover the costs of relocating the person.

As evacuation orders are rare and, when they do occur, are followed by the vast majority of people in an affected area, changes such as those introduced in Manitoba are intended to provide further support to voluntary evacuations by encouraging people to recognize the serious and grave nature of an evacuation order and to voluntarily comply with directions to leave their property without delay.

**Relevant sections in the legislation:**

- Sections 9, 10, 12 and 13 of the *Emergency Program Act*

**Proposal:**

1. Consider adding authority for police to apprehend any person who refuses to comply with an evacuation order issued under a declared state of emergency for the purpose of taking the person to a place of safety similar to sections 18.1 to 18.3 of the Manitoba *Emergency Measures Act*.

   - As part of this proposal, also consider the following supporting provisions:
     
     - Providing police with a right of entry and use of reasonable force to enforce an evacuation order;
     
     - Limiting the period of apprehension to be no longer than reasonably required to take a person to a place of safety; and
     
     - Authority for the province (in a state of provincial emergency) or a local authority (in a state of local emergency) to order a person who was apprehended to pay the costs incurred by police in taking the action to enforce the evacuation order.

**Additional information for consideration:**

- Manitoba’s *Emergency Measures Act*:
  
  [https://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/e08oe.php](https://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/statutes/ccsm/e08oe.php)
Discussion 11:
Employment protection

Background:
The Emergency Program Act provides authority in a state of emergency for a local authority or the provincial government to require a person to provide emergency assistance that the person is qualified to provide or may be required in order to prevent, respond to or alleviate the effects of an emergency or disaster.

The Act also provides (under section 25) that where a person is ordered to provide assistance under a state of emergency, that person’s employment may not be terminated because of their being required to provide assistance.

Challenge in the current legislative framework:
A person who is ordered to provide assistance under a state of emergency is providing a civic service similar to jury duty; however, the Act currently does not provide a similar level of employment protection.

The scope of protection under s. 25 of the Act also appears to be specifically limited to a person who has been the subject of an order requiring the person to provide assistance in a declared state of emergency and, as such, does not appear to apply to a person who acts voluntarily (i.e. not under an order) or who acts in an emergency for which no state of emergency or local emergency has been declared.

Relevant sections in the legislation:
- Section 10(1)(e) and section 25 of the Emergency Program Act

Proposal:
1. Consider whether employment protection should be limited only to the duration of a state of emergency or whether the protection should extend to cover, for example, travel to and from the emergency or a time period after an emergency if the person is still required to provide assistance.
   - A further consideration here could include situations where a person is recovering from illness or injury as a result of providing assistance during an emergency.
   - Consideration should also be given to whether volunteers or other persons who assist in responding to and recovering from an emergency or disaster are entitled to employment protection in circumstances where they have not been ordered to provide assistance.

2. Consider expanding the protection against loss of employment in section 25 of the Act to include the same protections as those provided for a person on jury duty under section 56 of the Employment Standards Act.
   - This would add protection for employment benefits and benefits based on seniority, as well as provide that a person who is providing assistance is deemed to be on leave and must not be terminated as a result of being required to provide assistance or because the person is absent or unable to perform employment duties while on deemed leave.

Additional information for consideration:
- BC’s Employment Standards Act:
  http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96113_01
Conclusion

In order to solidify and maintain cooperative and effective approaches to emergency management in British Columbia, partners across the emergency management spectrum in British Columbia and the citizens of this province must engage in thoughtful and meaningful discussions so that we are ready when challenged by known and emergent threats to public safety. This consultation and engagement is but one of many steps we are taking together to ensure we are prepared and resilient.

Submissions may be made on the contents herein on or before Feb. 19, 2016. At the closing of the consultation period, all submissions will be reviewed and analyzed for themes and suggestions that can be compiled and presented by Minister Yamamoto to the Cabinet Committee on Secure Tomorrow on or before March 31, 2016, in accordance with the Minister’s mandate letter.

Thank you to all who took time to consider this document’s contents and submit feedback.
Happy New Year! Please join us to celebrate another wonderful year at Kay Meek Centre for the Performing Arts.
Should you have any questions please let me know. Cheers, Elaine
WEST VANCOUVER ARTS CENTRE TRUST cordially invites you to our

CHAIR’S RECEPTION

IN RECOGNITION OF YOUR SUPPORT OF KAY MEEK CENTRE FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Wednesday, January 20th, 2016
6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Mix and mingle for sponsors, major donors and community partners.

Studio Theatre
Kay Meek Centre

A select number of seats have been put aside should you wish to stay for the Porte Parole presentation of SEEDS starring Eric Peterson. Please indicate when you RSVP if you would also like to stay for the show.

Please RSVP by January 15th
arezoo@kaymeekcentre.com or call 604-981-6335
January 8, 2016

Mayor Smith and Council  
District of West Vancouver  
750 17th Street  
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3

Dear Mayor Smith and Council:

On behalf of Creative BC, I would like to thank you, members of your Council, and your administration for your continued support of British Columbia’s motion picture industry.

Creative BC is an independent non-profit agency created, and supported, by the Province of British Columbia to help grow its creative sector which includes the motion picture (film and television), digital and interactive media, music, magazine and book publishing industries.

As you know, BC’s motion picture industry is a major contributor to our provincial economy, creating thousands of jobs and benefitting local communities. BC is also one of the top three full-service production centres in North America and a destination of choice among major US studios such as Disney, Warner Bros., Paramount and Columbia Pictures, to name a few. We also have a dynamic domestic industry that produces a wide range of screen-based entertainment that is seen by audiences around the world.

The fact that BC has gained an international reputation as a leading motion picture production centre is due in part to the strong support it receives from local governments such as yours. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the work of Christie Rosta and Magda K Waterska and their staff for their assistance in meeting the needs of producers from BC and around the world over the past year.

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce you to Marnie Orr, Creative BC’s Community Engagement Manager. Marnie is responsible for helping resolve Industry production issues with all levels of government and stakeholders, proactively advising on the development of standardized guidelines and procedures to facilitate production and building strong community relationships.

We look forward to working with you to ensure BC remains a film-friendly destination that benefits both local communities and the production community in the coming year.

Yours sincerely,

Pram Gill  
CEO
From: Vanessa Garrett
Sent: January-11-16 11:34 AM
To: northshore@bikehub.ca
Cc: Mayor and Council; Raymond Fung; Suzanne Rowell
Subject: Council Correspondence regarding “Improving Safety on the Spirit Trail”
Attachments: DOC.PDF

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Tony Valente:

Your email with attachment regarding ‘Improving Safety on the Spirit Trail’, was forwarded on to me.

Thank you for taking the time to conduct an assessment on sections of the Spirit Trail, from a cyclist’s perspective. I will review your proposed recommendations and take them under advisement.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Garrett, P.Eng, FMP
Manager, Roads and Transportation | District of West Vancouver
Cypress Eowl Operations Centre | 3755 Cypress Bowl Rd, West Vancouver, BC V7S 3E7
d: 604-921-2933 | f: 604-925-5988 | westvancouver.ca
January 4th, 2016

Mayor Michael Smith and Council
750 - 17th Street
West Vancouver BC V7V 3T3

Re: Improving Safety on the Spirit Trail

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

HUB – Your Cycling Connection is a charitable organization working to get more people cycling, more often and making cycling safer and better through education, action and events. More cycling means healthier, happier, more connected communities.

Earlier this fall, five members of our HUB North Shore Committee conducted a group assessment ride along the Spirit Trail from 13th Street and Argyle Avenue in West Vancouver to Bewicke Avenue in North Vancouver. The purpose of the ride was to identify safety hazards for cyclists and recommend improvements to address them. On the West Vancouver section of the Spirit Trail, starting from 13th Street and proceeding east to Whonoak Road, we identified a number possible safety hazards.

The attached table lists the safety hazards that we encountered their location and some proposed solutions. A number of these could be addressed by installing a few signs and applying paint on the paved surface. For example, we feel that applying green paint to the crosswalks and painting a centre line on more of the trail would improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

There are two locations that we found particularly hazardous for cyclists. The first being the Wardance bridge and its approaches and the other being the intersection of the Spirit Trail and Capilano Road. We appreciate that the District has taken some action regarding the Wardance bridge by reducing the speed limit, painting sharrows on the lanes across the bridge, improving the Pacific Capilano Trail under the bridge and installing a traffic-separating island and a crossing for pedestrians and cyclists at the approach to the east end of the bridge. We are also aware of Park Royal's plans to add a multi-purpose path across the south side of the bridge. Irrespective of those plans, there are a few additional safety measures that can be taken which are explained in the attached table.

With regard to the second location, we have not seen any measures yet taken to address the potential hazard of motorists on Welch Street turning north to Capilano Road on a green light and not being aware of cyclists on the Spirit Trail approaching the intersection.
We would appreciate being updated on plans to address the two major safety hazards and consideration being given to the suggestions that we are making to improve safety on the Spirit Trail.

Yours truly,

Tony Valente,  
Chair, HUB North Shore  
HUB: Your Cycling Connection  
northshore@bikehub.ca

Attachment: Safety Hazards for Cyclists on West Vancouver’s Paved Spirit Trail
## Safety Hazards for Cyclists on West Vancouver's Paved Spirit Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SAFETY HAZARD</th>
<th>SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All along the Spirit Trail                        | 1. Pedestrians, some with strollers and dogs on leash, as well as some cyclists, not keeping to the right-hand side of the trail which presents a risk of collisions.  
2. Bollards at street intersections are a hazard, especially when there are more than one, causing cyclists to focus on avoiding the bollards which distracts them from looking out for automobile traffic at intersections and for other approaching users on the Spirit Trail. | 1. Paint a centre line on the trail like the one already on the curve under the CN railway tracks and on the multi-purpose pathway on the outside cloverleaf at the north end of the Lions Gate Bridge. Some directional “keep to the right” signage may also help.  
2. Eliminate bollards on a trial basis and, if deemed necessary, re-install just one further back from intersections following the design of the one installed at 13th and Argyle. In place of bollards, a no-entry sign for auto-mobiles along with a painted centre line and a bicycle/pedestrian stencil should suffice. |
<p>| All crosswalks with a painted circular design and elephant feet. | Most motorists and many cyclists do not understand that elephant feet in a crosswalk mean that cyclists can legally ride in the crosswalk, therefore motorists may not be expecting to see cyclists riding in these crosswalks. | Apply green paint along with a white bicycle/pedestrian stencil in each crosswalk. The application of green paint is becoming common throughout Metro Vancouver in locations where there is a possible conflict between cyclists and motorists. |
| Immediately west of the terminus of the spur route off of the Spirit Trail which leads to Park Royal South. | There are no marked bike lanes on the short section of the east-west roadway connecting the Spirit Trail to the existing marked bike lanes in Park Royal South or a safe crossing lane for cyclists wanting to proceed from the Spirit Trail across the roadway and westward into Park Royal South. | Marked bike lanes on each side of the short section of roadway connecting the Spirit Trail to the existing bike lanes in Park Royal. Also, a green painted crossing lane with a bicycle stencil from the Spirit Trail to the proposed bike lane on the north side of the east-west roadway and/or signage on the roadway warning motorists that there may be cyclists crossing from the Spirit Trail. Additionally, green paint in the proposed bike lane on the north side of the roadway where vehicles enter and exit the elevated parking lots. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SAFETY HAZARD</th>
<th>SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where the Spirit Trail connects to the west end of the Wardance Bridge.</td>
<td>1. There is no safe, easy way for eastbound cyclists to enter onto the bridge traffic lanes at the point where the Spirit Trail ends at the sidewalk leading up to the bridge resulting in some cyclists riding on the narrow sidewalk on the south side of the bridge which can be hazardous due to heavy pedestrian traffic. Cyclists are at risk while transitioning down from the high sidewalk curb and possibly losing control in front of approaching traffic. 2. Many westbound Spirit Trail cyclists exiting the bridge negotiate their way through the often congested four-way stop at the Taylor Way intersection then cross the roadway further west to get back onto the Spirit Trail. These cyclists are not aware that there is a concrete pass-through immediately before the stop sign at Taylor Way which leads to a circular route onto the improved section of the Capilano Pacific Trail under the bridge and directly onto the Spirit Trail.</td>
<td>1. Construct a narrow, angled concrete let-down from the sidewalk at the end of the Spirit Trail onto the eastbound traffic lane leading onto the bridge with a green painted square, at the point of entry, in the middle of the lane. Inside the square, include a white bicycle/sharrow stencil (see photo below this table taken on MacKay Avenue in North Vancouver). A sign warning motorists of the possibility of cyclists entering the lane and/or share-the-road signage may also be helpful. 2. On the north side of the roadway, just before the stop sign and concrete pass-through at Taylor Way, place a sign with a curved arrow pointing to the Spirit Trail. Also, place another sign at the entrance to the Capilano Pacific Trail pointing southwest to the Spirit Trail and northeast to the other two bridges over the Capilano River at Marine Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>SAFETY HAZARD</td>
<td>SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wardance Bridge.</td>
<td>The traffic lanes often have heavy traffic and the sharrow are faded and painted on the right-hand side of lanes which are, in places, too narrow for shared bicycle/automobile traffic.</td>
<td>Cyclists should be encouraged to take the lanes by placing green painted squares in the middle of the lanes with a white bicycle/sharrow stencil inside of the squares (see photo below this table). Share-the-road signage may also be helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Where the Spirit Trail connects to the east end of the Wardance Bridge. | 1. Most eastbound cyclists heading to the Lions Gate Bridge cross the road before reaching the crosswalk with elephant feet and have limited visibility of approaching automobiles coming from the south on Bridge Road. Furthermore, motorists may not be expecting cyclists crossing the road at this point.  
2. There is a risk of collision between westbound cyclists and automobiles at the exit from the bridge to the upper Park Royal South parking lots and on the approach to the bridge where they enter and exit the Capilano River RV Park. | 1. Install a separate bicycle crossing just to the west of the existing crosswalk and paint it green with a white embedded bicycle stencil.  
2. Green paint in the lanes at these two points of possible automobile/bicycle conflict. |
| The intersection of the Spirit Trail and Capilano Road. | The HUB North Shore Committee considers this to be one of the most hazardous locations on the Spirit Trail. This is due the fact that motorists on Welch Street turning north to Capilano Road on a green light cannot easily see cyclists on the Spirit Trail approaching the intersection. It is especially hazardous for eastbound cyclists which eastbound motorists turning north onto Capilano Road don’t expect to encounter, but also hazardous for all cyclists when westbound motorists turn north on to Capilano Road. | On Welch Street, there needs to be a separate left-turn traffic signal for eastbound automobile traffic wanting to turn north on Capilano Road (note than when the left-turn light is green, the existing pedestrian/cyclist crosswalk light would be red). For westbound cyclists at this intersection, green pain in the crosswalk and a road sign advising motorists of possible cyclists and pedestrians crossing would improve safety for them both. Controlled right hand turns for westbound motorists should also be considered. |
January 12, 2016

Bill Senghera
President and Telethon Co-Chair
Variety—The Children's Charity
e-mail: info@variety.bc.ca

Dear Mr. Senghera:

Re: Request for Proclamation Variety – The Children’s Charity Week

Thank you for your correspondence dated December 12, 2015 regarding Variety—The Children's Charity Week (February 8-14, 2016), Variety's 50th anniversary, and 50th annual Show of Hearts Telethon on Global BC.

While the issuance of proclamations by the District was discontinued several years ago, Council was appreciative of receiving the information, which has also been posted on the District's website.

Thank you again for providing the information for Council.

Sincerely,

S. Scholes
Manager, Legislative Services
December 12, 2015

Dear Mayor and Council,

February 13th and 14th, 2016 mark the 50th anniversary of Variety's Show of Hearts Telethon, one of North America's longest running telethons, and an iconic weekend dedicated to supporting children in British Columbia with special needs. In honour of this milestone we have a very exciting show planned this year.

During Telethon weekend on Global BC (and live streamed through globalbc.ca/live/bc and variety.bc.ca) we'll be celebrating 50 years of Telethon moments and introducing amazing children from communities across the province who have been helped by Variety and the generous donors of B.C. Featuring familiar faces from the past and introducing new friends of Variety, we'll also be bringing back live entertainment - all to raise funds for an even more impactful future providing direct help to children with special needs.

Throughout BC, in cities and towns and across our wide rural expanses there are children and families whose lives have been improved because Variety - The Children's Charity stepped in where health care ended. And in those same areas are our donors, people who generously give so that Variety can continue to help children with special needs in our province.

These are people in your home town. And that is why we're asking Mayors and Councils to be a part of this milestone celebration through a proclamation declaring the week of February 8th to 14th as Variety Week and help us launch another 50 years of helping kids and families in our communities.
Your proclamation will be shared with the entire province on our Telethon, through social media, and on our Variety web site: www.variety.bc.ca

If you will be declaring Variety Week, we kindly request that you confirm by email to info@variety.bc.ca by January 29, 2016 to be included in the social media and Telethon recognition.

On behalf of the countless volunteers, our amazing staff and dedicated Board members, I wish to thank you for considering our request. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this further, I can be reached at bills@whitespot.ca or 604.321.6631 x 217.

Sincerely,

Bill Senghera
President and Telethon Co-Chair
Sample proclamation

City of XXXX, Province of British Columbia

WHEREAS, Variety - The Children’s Charity of British Columbia has operated as a not-for-profit organization in British Columbia for 50 years; and

WHEREAS, Variety is celebrating its golden 50th anniversary of helping children with special needs throughout the province of British Columbia; and

WHEREAS, on February 13 and 14 Variety will host its 50th Annual Show of Hearts Telethon on Global B.C.; and

WHEREAS, Variety’s Show of Hearts Telethon has raised more than $189 million dollars over 49 years and helped tens of thousands of children in British Columbia with special needs and their families; and

WHEREAS, Variety provides much needed funding for, mobility and communications equipment and therapies, medical care and services, as well as education and experiences not covered by private or public health plans, and is committed to doing so for another 50 years; and
NOW, THEREFORE, I [name] Mayor of this City of [community], of the Province of British Columbia, do hereby declare the week of February 8th – 14th, 2016

VARIETY - THE CHILDREN’S CHARITY WEEK

in, [community], British Columbia, and encourage every citizen of [community] to pledge your support to this important organization.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and caused the official seal of the City of [community], Province of British Columbia, to be affixed at XXXX on this day of [month], [date], 2016

MAYOR [name]