

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE UPDATE TO SEPTEMBER 11, 2024 (8:30 a.m.)

Correspondence

- (1) September 6, 2024, regarding “Eagle Island Barge Bylaw”**
- (2) September 6, 2024, regarding Traffic Calming Request**
- (3) September 6, 2024, regarding “Impark” (Parking in West Vancouver Parks)**
- (4) September 6, 2024, regarding “Re: beach Access” (Proposed Road Closure and Removal of Highway Dedication Bylaw No. 5342, 2024)**
- (5) 3 submissions, September 8-9, 2024, regarding Fuel Thinning and Wildfire Management**
- (6) September 9, 2024, regarding Invasive Species in Hay Park**

Correspondence from Other Governments and Government Agencies

- (7) P. Weiler, M.P. (West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country) (3 submissions), September 9-10, 2024, regarding Federal Programs and Initiatives**
- (8) Metro Vancouver, September 10, 2024, regarding “What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing”**

Responses to Correspondence

No Items.

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 12:22 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Eagle Island Barge Bylaw

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing in regard to the decision by council to regulate the residents only dock space on Eagle Island and the corresponding mainland dock. It is my understanding that a bylaw is being developed that would regulate the number of barges permitted for each residential lot on Eagle Island. The maximum being one per residence. It is my belief that council has been misled by a small faction of residents on the island and have been put in a position to make a decision without all the facts. I have watched the council meeting where the decision was made to move forward with the bylaw. I have read the quotes from certain Eagle Island residents in the North Shore News article published on June 2, 2024. It would appear council only took the word of a minority of Eagle Islanders and did not petition everyone on the island to get an understanding of the issue.

As a [REDACTED] s. 22(1), I can attest that there has never been a social contract or unwritten rule where there should only be one barge per residence. What has been published in the NS News and explained to council in this regard is pure fiction. In fact, up until last year, [REDACTED] s. 22(1) for many years had two barges in their possession. Both were always parked at the public island only docks. If there was a social contract it somehow did not apply to this home.

A small number of people became upset when the owners of [REDACTED] s. 22(1) obtained a second barge. Which makes no sense [REDACTED] s.22(1) already had a second barge. Then around June of 2023 this second barge [REDACTED] s.22(1) magically disappeared. It is my understanding the barge numbers were discussed at an Eagle Island Residents Association (EIRA) meeting that same month and a recommendation was made to talk to the DWV about policing the barges. Honestly, it seems they thought the best way to make their case to the district would be to get rid of [REDACTED] s.22(1) second barge in order to make it look like there is only one barge per household, claim there is a social contract and ask the district to regulate it.

A note about the EIRA: It was set up in order to make communication with the district more efficient and less burdensome for district staff. For example, instead of the district receiving 20 complaints about a burnt out dock light. As residents, we let the EIRA know and they communicate to the appropriate DWV department. It has also been invaluable when it comes to dealing with fire safety and medical emergency planning. However, it was never intended to be used as a way to influence council decisions. The EIRA is not and should not be political in anyway. Therefore, any recommendations such as asking for a bylaw is illegitimate as it is not the original intention of the Association.

Finally, this has nothing to do with the number of barge spaces and barges. It stems from a dispute between the homeowners of [REDACTED] s. 22(1). It goes back to when the owners of [REDACTED] s.22(1) Somehow this unfairly made the [REDACTED] s. 22(1) a pariah on the island. It just seems to be completely vindictive on the part of this small faction and sadly they have dragged council into the dispute. You've been asked to make a bylaw to punish one home owner on Eagle Island. That doesn't seem fair to them or anyone. I can guarantee the majority of residents on Eagle Island do not want this type of regulation. It is totally unnecessary. There is no issue with the current number of barges as there is more than enough dock space for everyone. I have never had a problem finding a spot.

I urge you to reconsider moving ahead with this bylaw. It will place a financial burden on owners, it is trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist, the majority of residents are opposed to it and most importantly it is the product of misinformation..

Thank you for your time.

s.22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s.22(1)

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 8:22 AM
To: Engineering Department; Jenn Moller; correspondence
Subject: Re: District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry [Redacted] s.22(1) - Traffic Calming - [Redacted] s.22(1)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [Redacted] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

DWV Engineering - Please READ my emails below.

On August 11, I responded to your email of July 3 requesting traffic calming for Keith Rd and Marine Dr in the noted areas (NOT [Redacted] s.22(1)). This email is below.

I did not receive a response to this August 11 email.

I wrote back again YESTERDAY to follow up. This is appended below as well.

Please review my August 11 email regarding Marine and Keith and advise what can be done to address the speeding, stunting and noise. I have made several suggestions and wish these acted upon. I also copied numerous concerned neighbours.

I also wish this to be raised at council and the Police Board as an ongoing roadway safety risk BEFORE we have a serious incident. Already there have been too many close calls at the Marine/Keith and [Redacted] s.22(1) intersections due to speed.

[Redacted] s. 22(1)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 5, 2024, at 14:13, Engineering Department
<engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca> wrote:

Hello [s. 22(1)],

On July 3 we sent you an email (bottom of thread), advising you that this street qualifies for Traffic Calming.

[s. 22(1)] is eligible for consideration under the new policy. If you would like to proceed with your request for traffic calming, please complete the Traffic Calming Request Form and petition found at <https://westvancouver.ca/services/transportation/roads-sidewalks/traffic-calming>.

For more information about the Traffic Calming Policy and Program, please visit westvancouver.ca/traffic-calming. A road classification map showing roadways eligible for traffic calming can also be found on the webpage. “

Please complete and submit the application and petition.

Regards,

Engineering & Transportation Services | District of West Vancouver
engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca | 604-925-7020

From: [s. 22(1)]
Sent: Thursday, September 5, 2024 2:06 PM
To: Engineering Department <engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca>; Jenn Moller <jmoller@westvancouver.ca>; correspondence <correspondence@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: Fwd: District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry # [s. 22(1)] - Traffic Calming - [s. 22(1)]
[s. 22(1)]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [s. 22(1)]. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

West Vancouver Council/Department of Engineering;

I sent the appended email almost one month ago (August 11) in response to yours dated July 3 (also appended) regarding traffic calming measures [s. 22(1)].

To date, I have not received a response or even an acknowledgement of my letter, which copied a number of local residents who share the same concerns.

I would appreciate this issue being given prompt, due consideration. Excessive speeds, stunting and noise have now become commonplace on the segments of Keith Road and Marine Drive noted in my letter below.

I have identified the likely sources of same and suggested some potential remediation that would go a long way to helping address these serious safety and quality of life concerns.

The City often takes a “tombstone approach” to roadway safety, acting only when incidents have occurred. A more proactive, risk based approach is required to avoid incidents in the first place and ensure the roads and neighbourhoods are safe for all.

We would hope the city takes this proactive approach to heart and look forward to a positive, action biased response.

s. 22(1)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Date: August 11, 2024 at 8:09:48 AM PDT
To: Engineering Department <engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca>
Cc: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
[Redacted] s. 22(1)
[Redacted] s. 22(1)
Subject: Fwd: District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry [Redacted] s.22(1)
[Redacted] s.22(1) - Traffic Calming - [Redacted] s.22(1)

This is further to your appended notice regarding implementation of traffic calming on [Redacted] s.22(1).

While [Redacted] s.22(1) itself doesn't require traffic calming per se to deal with speed and noise (removal of an outcrop obstructing sightlines [Redacted] s.22(1) roadway's hill is pending and will improve safety), there are two [Redacted] s.22(1) roadways [Redacted] s.22(1) that DO require traffic calming. Speeds and stunting have become excessive in recent years and with that, loud engine and exhaust noises. This now happens 7x24.

These roadways have become both highly unsafe and a disturbance.

The roadway segments of concern are:

1) Marine Drive between Cypress Creek and the 4500 block of Marine Drive

This 500m section of Marine Drive is the only segment of wide, tangent roadway in the area and has become a speedway for motorcycles and vehicles, mostly sports cars. Speeds observed have reached 80-100 kph and fast acceleration and loud engine noises are now very common at all times of day and night.

This is inherently dangerous given the intersection with Keith Road and the numerous pedestrians and driveways along this section of roadway, let alone the other vehicles and the bicycles using this stretch of roadway (which are often travelling at excessive speeds eastbound as well coming down the hill on the west end of this segment).

It seems that this is the part of Marine Drive that many drivers decide to “open it up” after dealing with the curves and slower roadway on either side of this stretch. The Isetta cafe and sports car rental in Gleneagles certainly attract more than a normal number of high performance vehicles to the area. There are no speed signs, speed bumps or traffic calming measures of any kind in this section of roadway.

2) The Keith Road Hill section between Marine Drive and Rockridge Road (CN Rail Overpass)

This section of roadway has also become problematic. The same ilk of drivers are now speeding up and down this section of roadway creating dangerous situations and excessive noise.

Of particular concern is the intersection of Keith s.22(1)
Vehicles descending the Keith hill at speeds in excess of 50kph only come into view for drivers exiting s.22(1) onto Keith in 1-2 seconds given the limited sightlines in the curve. This is extremely dangerous and there have been numerous near misses especially in poor weather. This is also

exacerbated by bush on the inside of the curve (as one descends) that needs to be cut back at least annually by the city. Many complaints have been made about this intersection before and are on file with engineering. Requests for improved sightlines and signage have gone unheeded.

I recognize the policy outlined below doesn't necessarily cover these roadways. However, they must be addressed before there is a serious incident. Already, numerous near misses have taken place at both the intersections of Keith and s.22(1) Keith and Marine. Use of vehicle horns, yelling (by pedestrians and cyclists) and sudden vehicle stopping/vehicle skidding is now commonplace.

As a minimum, I would request the city/district implement the following:

1) improved signage - specifically:

a) the addition of speed limit signs that restrict speeds to no more than 40 kph in these areas which is more than a sufficient speed given the residential area and especially given the hill and curve descending into the s.22(1) intersection.

b) improved signage descending Keith Road that more clearly conveys the s.22(1) intersection at the bottom of the hill and curve. Presently, these signs do not properly indicate the configuration of the intersection, its close position and distance coming out of the curve at the bottom of the hill, or even a required slower speed. (Current signage is inadequate, inaccurate, defaced and is no longer fully visible at night. The standard 50kph is too fast when entering the intersection).

2) the introduction of intermittent speed bumps such as those recently installed on Westmount between Southridge and Benbow. These will serve to limit speeds especially approaching the intersections. I recognize there may be resistance to adding such structures on these roadways given they are emergency routes BUT something more proactive must be done to limit speeds and noise.

3) more frequent patrolling by West Van Police or installation of speed cameras. This is understandably not ideal given the cost and reactive approach versus a more proactive approach with signage and speed

bumps. But it must be considered as part of a program to improve roadway safety in these areas.

I am happy to discuss these solutions (and others) but urge the city to take action on these concerns before there is a major incident. I think you will find that in a survey of the affected areas, all residents share the same concerns. (I have copied some fellow neighbours should they wish to follow up).

I look forward to a positive response.

s. 22(1)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Engineering Department
<engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca>
Date: July 3, 2024 at 1:54:11 PM PDT
To: s. 22(1)
Cc: Engineering Department
<engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca>
Subject: District of West Vancouver Engineering Enquiry s.22(1) - Traffic Calming - s.22(1)

Hello,

In March 2024, Council approved a new Traffic Calming Policy, which outlines the District's approach to identifying and prioritizing how and in which circumstances traffic calming measures requested by the public may be implemented.

You are receiving this notice because your request for traffic calming on s.22(1) is affected by this new policy.

Under the new policy, traffic calming measures are only considered on local roads, excluding cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets less than 90 metres long, and on collector roads located within school or playground zones. Additionally, all traffic calming requests must be accompanied by signatures of support from 50% of the owners in the benefiting area.

s.22(1)

is eligible for consideration under the new policy. If you would like to proceed with your request for traffic calming, please complete the Traffic Calming Request Form and petition found at <https://westvancouver.ca/services/transportation/roads-sidewalks/traffic-calming> .

For more information about the Traffic Calming Policy and Program, please visit westvancouver.ca/traffic-calming. A road classification map showing roadways eligible for traffic calming can also be found on the webpage.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss further, please contact us directly at 604-925-7020 or engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca

Regards,

Engineering & Transportation Services | District of West Vancouver
engineeringdept@westvancouver.ca | 604-925-7020

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 10:52 AM
To: correspondence
Subject: Impark

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Reading an article on the Ontario family visit to Lighthouse park unfortunate experience with being ticketed by Impark. After spending 30 minutes trying to pay. Then calling Impark to resolve and an exercise in futility by their response. We have had a similar situation in Vancouver with Imparks faulty machines and system failures and have heard of others similarly. This is not acceptable to enter into a contract/partnership with such an unscrupulous company. We are residents and taxpayers in West Vancouver for almost 40 years and are appalled at the Council's decision to impose this onto us and visitors.

Please provide me with a copy of the contract between Impark and District of West Vancouver.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED]
West Vancouver

Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2024 3:15 PM
To: correspondence
Cc: West Vancouver Parks (westvanparks)
Subject: Re: beach Access

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Hi, I would like to oppose the closure of the beach access path at the foot of 30th St in West Vancouver. This is a public path and should stay that way. To close this path to appease a wealthy buyer, and I believe an acquaintance of the mayor, is just wrong. Just because someone has money and connections to decision makers should not mean that they can get everything they ask for. I ask that you reconsider closing this popular beach access path.

Thank you for listening,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)
[REDACTED]
West Vancouver BC [REDACTED] s. 22(1)

From: Paul Hundal [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2024 7:58 PM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson
Subject: Item 7.3 Council Agend Sept 9 2024 -Serious inconsistency between information in report to Council and actual prescription

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

To Mayor and Council:

In the report to Council under Item 7.3 there is a serious inconsistency between the information in that report with the actual Prescription document for cutting trees that was provided to me in spring. Below you will see two images. One is from the actual prescription of how many trees will be cut down. It says for trees between 17.5 cm diameter breast height (DBH) and 27.5 cm for a **total of 424 live trees per hectare being cut down but in the staff report to Council on page 84 it says only dead trees are being cut between 17.7 cm DBH and 25 cm DBH.** So the question for Council and staff is which is right? They both cannot be right. Is the actual prescription document filled out by the forester wrong or is the attachment filled out by staff in the Council Report wrong.

If the actual Prescription document is correct, 4664 live trees in total in the size class between 17.5 cm DBH to 27.5 cm DBH will be cut down (424/ha x 11 ha=4664). That is a huge difference to the staff report to Council saying only dead trees in that size range are being cut.

The public deserves to know which statement is correct. Unfortunately this item is on the Consent Agenda list to be rubber stamped and would not be discussed. It instead deserves discussion and clarification as well as public input. I mentioned in my last email that a peer-reviewed study came out indicating that these kinds of "fuel treatments", when applied to our coastal forest, may actually increase the risk of wildfire by drying out the ground more and increasing wind speed through the stand. If that is so then we would be paying half a million dollars this year alone to potentially increase the risk of wildfire. We should not be spending that money until more is known as to what benefit, if any, it has. If we defer this spending then there is no need to apply for the grant. Can this be removed from the Consent Agenda list so the public can comment on it?

H. STAND AND STOCK TABLE

Statement of Limitations: Stand descriptions and pre-harvest stand structure numbers are estimates only and should not be relied upon by Contractors for estimating budgets used in bidding or tender preparation. Contractors are responsible for conducting site visits to gather sufficient information for tender preparation.

LAYER	Definition	Species Composition by basal area (L1) by density (L2-L4)	Stems per hectare	Basal area (m ² /ha)	DBHq (cm)	Heightq (m)	Volume (m ³)	Crown Closure (% Cover)	Height to Live Crown (m)
L1 Merch	>17.5cm DBH	Fd ₇₇ Hw ₁₃ Cw ₆ Pl ₄	869	63	37	28	531	Average: 70% Range: 65-75%	Range: 2-8 m
L1 Submerch	12.5 - 17.5 cm DBH	Fd ₁₀₀	147	3	15	9	5		
L2	7.5 - 12.5 cm DBH	Dead ₅₀ Cw ₃₇ Hw ₁₀ Fd ₃	500						
L3	<7.5 cm DBH, >1.3m height	Dead ₄₀ Cw ₃₉ Hw ₁₁ Fd ₂	767						
L4	<1.3m height	Cw ₁₀₀	83						
Species and Diameter Class		Average Crown to Base Height (m)	Average Tree Height (m)	STEMS PER HECTARE (sph)			VOLUME PER HECTARE (m ³ /ha)		
				Existing	Cut	Leave	Existing	Cut	Leave
Layer 1 (> 22.5 cm - 27.5 cm dbh)*									
Fd		8	30	135	90	45	51	34	17
Total Live		8	30	135	90	45	51	34	17
Total All Species		8	30	135	90	45	51	34	17
Layer 1 (> 17.5cm dbh - 22.5 cm dbh)									
Hw		5	25	39	39	0	8	8	0
Cw		5	20	36	36	0	3	3	0
Fd		5	25	259	259	0	41	41	0
Total Live		5	25	334	334	0	52	52	0
Total All Species		5	25	334	334	0	52	52	0
Layer 1 (≥ 12.5 cm - 17.5 cm dbh)									
Cw		4	16	83	83	0	0	0	0
Fd		4	16	100	100	0	5	5	0
Dead		4	16	83	83	0	0	0	0
Total Live		4	16	183	183	0	5	5	0
Total All Species		4	16	266	266	0	5	5	0

Page 84 of Report to Council Item 7.3 Sept.9, 2024

Eagle Lake: The objectives of this prescription are to improve the resiliency of the drinking water reservoir and critical water infrastructure to wildfire; reduce the potential rate of spread and intensity of wildfire in the area (see targets below); create an anchor point for firefighting and fire suppression efforts for a fire moving from the south and west (following prevailing winds) towards homes in the British Properties; and, reduce the wildfire risk to the surrounding community and increase public safety. This will be achieved by reducing/maintaining critical surface fire intensity to less than 2000 kw/m by reducing FWD loading to 0.5kg/m² and CWD to 0.5kg/m², removing all conifers and dead trees <17.5cm dbh, remove dead trees only between 17.5-25cm dbh, and >25 cm dbh remove only hazard trees. Post-treatment density should be 600-800 sph conifers ~4 m intertree distance. The primary objective is to remove dead trees and ladder fuels, leaving a healthy and resilient stand, not to achieve any particular stand density.

Woodburn: The objectives of this prescription are to reduce the wildfire risk to adjacent residents and private property along Woodburn Crescent, Woodburn Road, Westwood Drive and The Glen, and increase public safety; reduce the potential rate of spread and intensity of wildfire in the area (see targets below); minimize negative impacts to wildlife habitat, forest health, and air quality through the appropriate management of the stand; and, restore the natural ecosystem of the forested areas of the park by removing yard waste dumping and the ingress of invasive and alien plant species. This will be achieved by reducing/maintaining critical surface fire intensity to less than 2000 kw/m by reducing FWD loading to 0.5kg/m² and CWD to 0.5kg/m², removing all conifers <22.5cm dbh to a target density of 400 sph, and pruning remaining conifers to 3m ht. All debris will be chipped and removed to a composting facility or used for other purposes (municipal operations).

Paul Hundal [Please do not redact name]

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1)

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 9:57 AM
To: correspondence; Mark Sager, Mayor; Christine Cassidy; Linda Watt; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson
Subject: [Possible Scam Fraud]Increasing the Risk of Wildfire Through Fuel/Forest Thinning

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [REDACTED] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

WARNING: Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat.

The sender may trick victims into passing bad checks on their behalf.

If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

Dear Mayor and Council,

Last Wednesday, forest ecologist and SFU adjunct professor, Rhonda Milliken, was interviewed on CBC Radio's *Early Edition*. She discussed the conclusions of her research paper, *The Impact of Fuel Thinning on the Microclimate in Coastal Rainforest Stands of Southwestern British Columbia, Canada* (Rhonda L. Milliken, et al). The paper was published in the journal *Fire* on August 14, 2024, following an international peer review process.

As Ms. Milliken explained during the interview, fuel thinning in the coastal forests of south western B.C. is compromising the natural resiliency of the forest to wildfire; it is increasing, not reducing, the risk of wildfire in these forests.

According to Milliken and her co-authors the combined effects of fuel thinning in the coastal forests that were studied resulted in a 58% increase in wildfire potential in the spring and a 37% increase in the late summer: "By fuel thinning, we're increasing solar radiation into the forest; we're increasing wind speed and ambient air temperature; decreasing relative humidity and the dead fuel moisture. All of these microclimate conditions resulting from fuel thinning increase fire susceptibility." ("Dead fuel moisture" includes large fallen logs that retain moisture in the forest throughout the summer, while fungi proliferate on the forest floor to decompose the litter.)

This much needed and overdue scientific research is telling us that our coastal forests are not the dry interior forests that the provincial guidelines and regulations are built around. The prevailing attitude may be that *we need to do something and this is what we have*, but if this *something* (fuel/forest thinning) is not only ineffective but is also, most probably, increasing the risks of wildfire, then this approach is extremely troubling and unwise. We now need to pivot and adopt approaches that are used and work elsewhere in the world, including New Zealand, Australia and China. The large sums of money spent on fuel thinning could better be spent on other, modern solutions and upgrading fire response equipment.

Early fire detection systems (sensors, satellite imagery, cameras, and AI) are now being employed in other jurisdictions in the country, throughout the United States, and elsewhere in the world. Earlier this year, the district had the opportunity to move in this direction at a special "hometown" rate. It appears now that this approach would provide us

with better protection from wildfire than fuel thinning at an annual cost savings. Perhaps this offer is still available to the municipality.

Of course, some West Vancouver citizens have been expressing their concerns about fuel/forest thinning to council and staff for at least a couple of years now.

This spring, members of the Environment Committee had similar concerns, passing a resolution at committee on April 9. It was presented to council as part of the Committee's Work Plan on April 29. (Unfortunately, for some reason, the Environment Committee had three of their upcoming meetings cancelled and will not convene again until October.)

The district needs to adopt a holistic strategy for managing and preserving our forests, one that addresses multiple mandates. Solutions to issues such as climate change, invasive species, and wildfire management need to be considered and enacted in concert with one another, not in isolation.

Our trees help keep our coastal forest (and also our neighbourhoods) cool in the heat of the summer. Trees sequester carbon and help mitigate climate change and provide many health benefits to the community, region and beyond. They contribute to needed drainage control, biodiversity and much, much more. Let us keep this in mind when we develop strategies around our trees and forests. Let us not engage in approaches that are either unfounded or are counterproductive.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

From: [REDACTED] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 4:12 PM
To: Christine Cassidy; correspondence; Nora Gambioli; Peter Lambur; Mark Sager, Mayor; Scott Snider; Sharon Thompson; Linda Watt
Subject: Item 7.3 regarding Union of British Columbia Municipalities' Community Resiliency Investment Program – 2024 FireSmart Community Funding and Supports Grant Application
Attachments: smime.p7s; ATT00001.txt; ATT00002.htm

Dear Council Members,

I support the approval and submission of the \$100,000 grant application for wildfire mitigation. However, in light of the latest peer-reviewed study by Dr. Rhonda Millikin, which highlights that thinning forests may increase fire risks by creating warmer and drier microclimates, I believe we should carefully reconsider how these funds are allocated.

It may be prudent to pause further thinning activities and instead invest in alternative measures that were recommended by the Environment Committee, ensuring we do not inadvertently heighten wildfire risks. Please find [here](#) the recommendations from the Environment Committee April 2024.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] s. 22(1) West Vancouver

[REDACTED] s. 22(1)

Caring for our environment one step at a time
Saying no to the status quo
Say yes to stepping up

From: [Redacted] s. 22(1)
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 5:56 PM
To: [Redacted] correspondence
Subject: [Redacted] s. 22(1) Private Property Issues [Redacted] s.22(1) Hay Park

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address [Redacted] s. 22(1). Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor and Members West Vancouver Council,

I am writing to bring to your attention ongoing issues related to Hay Park [Redacted] s. 22(1). Over [Redacted] s.22(1) experienced significant challenges due to the trees, invasive Japanese knotweed and blackberries that have become increasingly problematic.

1. Japanese Knotweed

Japanese Knotweed is currently the most immediate problem. We discovered Knotweed in the park two years ago, which we immediately reported to the Parks Department. We were told that it would be recorded and treated. This past May I noticed it was still growing [Redacted] s. 22(1) in the Park. I phoned the District again and was told Knotweed is a problem in many areas and that it is treated on a priority basis. I took this as meaning don't expect immediate treatment. Fast forward to this August when I noticed the plant had grown much taller - approximately 12 feet - reaching over [Redacted] s.22(1). When called, District staff told us the plant had been treated and that we are responsible for hiring a private contractor [Redacted] s.22(1).

First I don't believe that treatment has occurred. Below is a photo of the very healthy Knotweed today - 3-4 weeks after District staff told me it had been treated. Following are photos of the invading plants [Redacted] s.22(1). Treatment is expensive and [Redacted] s. 22(1) should not be responsible for the District's failure to effectively treat the outbreak of this highly invasive species I reported 2 years ago.

2. Damage from falling tree

Three years ago, a large tree from the park fell [Redacted] s.22(1). We were told this was an insurance claim and not the District's responsibility. [Redacted] s.22(1). However this incident has left us concerned about [Redacted] s.22(1) further property damage as other trees continue to add 5 feet per year.

s.22(1), we submitted an application to the city remove some of the trees, and we were granted permission at a personal cost of about s. 22(1). After this incident we requested to remove a few of the larger trees s. 22(1) at our cost but were told the District would not permit any tree removal..

3. Blackberry Bushes

s.22(1) invading blackberry bushes every year since s.22(1). Shortly after we had several 30-40 foot tall Alders removed as noted above, s.22(1) cleared out all the blackberry bushes in a 100 foot stretch of Hay Park and planted several Vine Maples and several other bushes in an attempt to naturalize the space. Since then the Blackberries has overtaken over the space again and for the first time after a call, the District actually cleared out 2 large sections of Blackberries. Thank You!

4. My Request

Given the recurring nature of these issues and the financial burden we have already shouldered, we believe it is reasonable to request the following:

1. ****District-Sponsored Treatment of Japanese Knotweed****: We ask that the District cover the cost of professionally treating and removing the Japanese knotweed that has spread s. 22(1)
2. ****Permission to Cut Back Trees****: We request permission to cut back or remove a few more of the trees that pose a potential threat s.22(1) and to prevent incurring additional costs from damage.

We believe these actions are the least the District could do in light of the ongoing issues s.22(1) s. 22(1). Addressing these concerns would not only help us s. 22(1) but also maintain the safety and aesthetics of the Park.

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your prompt response.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1)

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)



From: Patrick Weiler MP <patrick.weiler@parl.gc.ca>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 5:00 PM
To: correspondence
Subject: You're invited to our End of Summer Community BBQ!

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address bounce_baf74b9e-076f-ef11-991a-6045bdd9e096_prod@bounce.myngp.com. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.





Dear Mayor and Council,

I hope you'll join me on Saturday, September 14 at Horseshoe Bay Park from 11:00am-2:00pm for our End of Summer Community BBQ.

This is a great opportunity to get to know your neighbours and fellow constituents, and connect with me in-person to chat about our riding and what you'd like me to focus on as we gear up for the return of the parliamentary session.

Food and refreshments will be served.

 : September 14, 2024, 11:00AM-2:00PM
 : Horseshoe Bay Park, West Vancouver

RSVP using the following form:

[Please RSVP using the Google Form here](#)

I look forward to seeing you there!

Sincerely,
Patrick Weiler

**OFFICE OF MP PATRICK WEILER
CONSTITUENCY OFFICE: 6367 BRUCE ST., WEST
VANCOUVER**

**OFFICE HOURS: WEEKDAYS
10AM-5PM**

Office of Patrick Weiler MP
6367 Bruce St
West Vancouver, BC V7W 2G5
Canada

If you believe you received this message in error or wish to no longer receive email from us, please [unsubscribe](#).

From: Weiler, Patrick - M.P. <Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Weiler, Patrick - M.P.
Subject: REMINDER - New Horizons for Seniors Program 2024-25 Community-Based Deadline September 12
Attachments: Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - New Horizons for Seniors Program – Community-based projects 2024-25.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Good afternoon,

A reminder that the deadline for organizations to submit applications to the New Horizons for Seniors Program – Community-based projects stream for 2024-25 is this **Thursday, September 12 at 12:00PM PDT**. Please see the attached letter for more information.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hemmat
Director of Communications
Office of Patrick Weiler MP
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country
Office: 604-913-2660
Cell: 604-353-2550
Kevin.Hemmat.842@parl.gc.ca



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRES DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Patrick Weiler

Member of Parliament
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

September 10, 2024

Dear Friends & Neighbours,

A reminder that the deadline for organizations to submit applications to the New Horizons for Seniors Program – Community-based projects stream for 2024-25 is on **September 12, 12:00PM PDT**.

Organizations are eligible to receive up to \$25,000 in grant funding. As part of the 2024-25 NHSP community-based call for proposals, organizations were able to apply for funding that supports the NHSP national priorities for this cycle:

Priority 1: Supporting healthy aging, including:

- addressing social isolation, including through supporting seniors' digital literacy;
- addressing ageism; and,
- supporting mental health and seniors living with dementia.

Priority 2: Preventing senior abuse, including:

- providing measures to reduce crimes and harm against seniors, including senior abuse; and,
- developing educational material to prevent unscrupulous practices, financial fraud and scams from happening to seniors.

Priority 3: Celebrating diversity and promoting inclusion, including:

- promoting intergenerational mentoring and engagement;
- advancing reconciliation with Indigenous peoples and helping to secure a better quality of life for Indigenous seniors; and
- collaborating with diverse communities, notably by serving members of vulnerable groups

Priority 4: Supporting financial security, including:

- helping seniors navigate and access government services and benefits and providing support to file their taxes; and
- supporting the financial empowerment of seniors.

For more information, visit [the New Horizons for Seniors Program – Community-based projects website](#).

Sincerely,

Patrick Weiler

Member of Parliament, West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

Constituency

6367 Bruce Street
West Vancouver
British Columbia, V7W 2G5
Tel: 604-913-2660 | Fax: 604-913-2664
Email : Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca

Ottawa

Suite 635, 180 Wellington St.
Wellington Building, Ottawa
Ontario, K1P 5B9
Tel: 613-947-4617 | Fax: 613-947-4620
Email : Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca

From: Weiler, Patrick - M.P. <Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 4:44 PM
To: Weiler, Patrick - M.P.
Subject: [Possible Scam Fraud]Announcing the launch of new School Food Infrastructure Fund and renewed Local Food Infrastructure Fund to improve food security in Canada
Attachments: Letter from MP Patrick Weiler - Launch of new School Food Infrastructure Fund and renewed Local Food Infrastructure Fund.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

WARNING: Your email security system has determined the message below may be a potential threat. The sender may propose a business relationship and submit a request for quotation or proposal. Do not disclose any sensitive information in response. If you do not know the sender or cannot verify the integrity of the message, please do not respond or click on links in the message. Depending on the security settings, clickable URLs may have been modified to provide additional security.

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached letter from MP Patrick Weiler regarding the launch of new School Food Infrastructure Fund and renewed Local Food Infrastructure Fund.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hemmat
Director of Communications
Office of Patrick Weiler MP
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country
Office: 604-913-2660
Cell: 604-353-2550
Kevin.Hemmat.842@parl.gc.ca



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRES DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Patrick Weiler

Member of Parliament
West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

September 10, 2024

Dear Friends & Neighbours,

All Canadians, particularly young Canadians, deserve to have access to nutritious food. We know that when kids eat well, they are set up for success. Communities in every region of our country have their own unique challenges when it comes to food security, and the federal government is taking action to address them.

This week, we announced the launch of the **new School Food Infrastructure Fund (SFIF) and the next phase of the Local Food Infrastructure Fund (LFIF)**. As part of the \$62.9-million announcement in [Budget 2024](#), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada will deliver these two programs aimed at supporting community-based not-for-profit organizations working to improve local food security for Canadians of all ages.

The new **School Food Infrastructure Fund (SFIF)** will help not-for-profit organizations invest in infrastructure and equipment to support school food programming across Canada. The \$20.2-million SFIF is delivered as a complement to both the [National School Food Program](#), and the guidance provided under the [National School Food Policy](#). **Eligible organizations are encouraged to apply until October 4, 2024.**

The renewed **Local Food Infrastructure Fund (LFIF)** will continue to help improve community food security and will be delivered through two components:

- **Small Scale Projects** will provide funding between \$25,000 and \$100,000 to support infrastructure projects, such as irrigation systems for community gardens or solar panels for greenhouses. Applications for the first intake will be open from October 1 to October 31, 2024. A second intake will be announced in 2025.
- **Large Scale Projects** will provide funding between \$150,000 and \$500,000 in support of community food security for projects with multiple infrastructure and equipment needs. For example, partners could come together to upgrade a soup kitchen and increase the number of meals served, using food from a local community garden, or a local farmer. Applications will be open from January 13 to February 28, 2025.

For more information, please visit the [Local Food Infrastructure Fund](#) webpage and the [School Food Infrastructure Fund](#) webpage.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to our office. We stand ready to support your application in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

Patrick Weiler
Member of Parliament, West Vancouver-Sunshine Coast-Sea to Sky Country

Constituency

6367 Bruce Street
West Vancouver
British Columbia, V7W 2G5
Tel: 604-913-2660 | Fax: 604-913-2664
Email : Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca

Ottawa

Suite 635, 180 Wellington St.
Wellington Building, Ottawa
Ontario, K1P 5B9
Tel: 613-947-4617 | Fax: 613-947-4620
Email : Patrick.Weiler@parl.gc.ca

From: Maureen Trainor <Maureen.Trainor@metrovancover.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2024 1:15 PM
To: Mark Sager, Mayor; correspondence
Cc: Scott Findlay; Chair Hurley; Jerry Dobrovolny; Heather McNell
Subject: What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing
Attachments: What Works Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing - Outgoing to District of West Vancouver.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization from email address Maureen.Trainor@metrovancover.org. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. If you believe this e-mail is suspicious, please report it to IT by marking it as SPAM.

Dear Mayor Mark Sager and Council:

On behalf of Chair Hurley, please find attached correspondence regarding What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing.

Regards,

Maureen Trainor
Office Manager and Executive Assistant
CAO Executive Office
t. 604-436-6919
c. 604-218-3130



September 10, 2024

File: CR-12-01
Ref: RD 2024 07 26

Mayor Mark Sager and Council
District of West Vancouver
750 17th St
West Vancouver, BC V7V 3T3
VIA EMAIL: mark@westvancouver.ca; correspondence@westvancouver.ca

Dear Mayor Mark Sager and Council:

**What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding
the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing**

At its July 26, 2024 regular meeting, the Board of Directors of the Metro Vancouver Regional District (MVRD) passed the following resolution:

That the MVRD Board:

- a) *receive for information the report dated June 3, 2024, titled “What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing”; and*
- b) *forward “What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing” and its attachment to member jurisdictions for information with an offer for staff or Council presentations upon request.*

What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing is the latest in Metro Vancouver’s existing “What Works” series of resource guides aiming to advance regional planning and housing policy goals through best practice research and policy analysis. The new guide profiles measures such as fee waivers and reductions, design and parking requirements, zoning and regulatory actions that can have an impact on new rental housing supply, and rental protection measures to sustain existing rental housing.

Metro 2050, the regional growth strategy, highlights the need to increase the supply of purpose-built rental housing as a strategy to achieve diverse and affordable housing choices across the region. Across Canada, purpose-built rental development has been facing financial feasibility challenges, owing to increases in interest rates and construction costs, requiring higher equity contributions and lower returns on investment for rental housing developers. In Metro Vancouver,

69660910

there were fewer than 10,000 new purpose-built rental units built between 2011 and 2021, compared to about 87,000 new renter households. In 2021, this translated to only one purpose-built rental unit for every 3.67 renter households in the region.

The results of the land economic analysis contained within the guide found that local government measures such as pre-zoning, reduced parking ratios, and reduced development fees can have a significant positive impact on the creation of new purpose-built rental housing. While many of these incentives are typically leveraged to support social and affordable housing, some communities may choose to extend incentives to purpose-built rental projects given the significant need for secure market rental housing. In addition, the results indicate that senior levels of government can have a similarly positive impact on purpose-built rental housing supply through programs that provide favourable financing through lower interest rates and longer amortization for market rental housing.

Should your jurisdiction be interested in receiving a presentation, or if you have any questions, please contact Jonathan Cote, Deputy General Manager, Regional Planning and Housing Development, by phone at 604-432-6391, or by email at jonathan.cote@metrovancover.org.

Yours sincerely,

s.22(1)



Mike Hurley
Chair, Metro Vancouver Board

MH/JC/jh

cc: Scott Findlay, Municipal Manager, District of West Vancouver
Jerry W. Dobrovolny, Commissioner/Chief Administrative Officer, Metro Vancouver
Heather McNell, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Policy and Planning, Metro Vancouver

Encl: [MVRD Board report dated June 3, 2024, titled "What Works: Local Government Measures for Sustaining and Expanding the Supply of Purpose-Built Rental Housing" \(pg. 48\)](#)

69660910