

**Municipality of North Cowichan  
Regular Council  
ADDENDUM AGENDA**

February 2, 2021

Pages

**1. LATE ITEMS**

- |      |                                                                                                                                |   |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| 1.1. | Supplementary documents in relation to agenda item 11.2 Request for Support by the Island Bus Service Provider to the Province | 1 |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|

**2. PUBLIC INPUT**

The following public input was received by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 2021. The author's personal information is not relevant and has been redacted from the document prior to publishing.

- |      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |    |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2.1. | Email in relation to agenda item 8.3 Rogers Communications Inc. Cell Tower Proposal Report and Presentation                                                                                                                            | 11 |
| 2.2. | Email in relation to consent agenda item 1.18 Kaspas Parking Lot, agenda item 8.3 Rogers Communications Inc. Cell Tower Proposal Report and Presentation, and agenda item 8.10 Public Participation During Electronic Council Meetings | 12 |
| 2.3. | Email in relation to consent agenda item 1.18 Kaspas Parking Lot, agenda item 8.3 Rogers Communications Inc. Cell Tower Proposal Report and Presentation, and agenda item 8.10 Public Participation During Electronic Council Meetings | 13 |
| 2.4. | Email in relation to agenda item 8.2 Finalizing the Climate Action and Energy Plan (CAEP) Model Update Report and Presentation                                                                                                         | 15 |
| 2.5. | In relation to Consent Agenda Item 1.18<br><br>3 Emails received in relation to Consent Agenda item 1.18 (Kaspas Road Parking Lot).                                                                                                    | 17 |
| 2.6. | In relation to Regular Agenda Item 8.9<br><br>5 Emails received in relation to Regular Agenda Item 8.9 (Temporary Relaxation of No Heavy Truck Route on Drinkwater Road).                                                              | 21 |



Dear Mayor Al Siebring and the North Cowichan Council,

It is with great urgency that I write to you today seeking a letter of support for a short-term emergency COVID recovery contract between Tofino Bus and the Province of BC and its Ministry of Transportation to continue our essential service until ridership is restored.

Intercity bus service provides the same essential service as public transit. It takes people to medical appointments, essential work, school, childcare and to get their prescriptions and groceries. It is particularly critical for those with low income and in remote communities. On Vancouver Island, twenty-nine communities and twenty-one First Nations and First Nations organizations are served with intercity busing by Vancouver Island Connector and Tofino Bus. In 2019 we provided 82,500 trips. Your community is among those we serve daily (see page 2 and 3 for locations).

Due to COVID 19 work and travel restrictions, revenue on these routes has been down 95% since March 2020. Tofino Bus has no more financial reserves, it has received all available government subsidies and grants and will be forced to close this service within the next four months if it does not have a source of revenue to operate them. With that many riders who rely on our services will have no other options to transport themselves.

**The Solution:**

To avoid the disruption, cost and public safety risk created by cancelling intercity busing on Vancouver Island, we have requested from Transportation Minister Rob Fleming a short-term emergency COVID recovery contract to continue this essential service until ridership is restored. This solution will prevent a gap in service for these communities, it will avoid government having to take on the cost of intercity busing on the island and it will ensure Tofino Bus is still around to serve these communities during economic recovery from COVID 19.

If you require any additional information at this time, please do not hesitate to reach out to our team. We know how important this service is to the communities on Vancouver Island and greatly appreciate whatever support you can offer us.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,

John Wilson  
President and CEO  
The Wilson's Group of Companies



**VI Connector and Tofino Bus**  
**Serviced Communities**

Victoria	Qualicum Bay
Saanich	Fanny Bay
View Royal	Buckley Bay
Langford	Union Bay
Mill Bay Langford	Royston
Cobble Hill	Courtenay
Cowichan Bay	Merville
Duncan	Black Creek
Chemainus	Oyster River
Ladysmith	Campbell River
Nanaimo – South	Coombs
Nanaimo - Central	Whiskey Creek
Nanaimo - North	Port Alberni
Parksville	Ucluelet
Qualicum Beach	Tofino



**First Nations and Provincial Ministries Served Through Contract with  
Tofino Bus**

- 
- 1 Ahousaht Band Council
  - 2 Alberni Clayoquot
  - 3 Ditidaht First Nations
  - 4 Ehattesaht/Chinehkint
  - 5 First Nations Health Authority
  - 6 Gwa'sala-'Nakwaxda'xw Nations
  - 7 Hesquiaht First Nation
  - 8 House of Himwitsa
  - 9 Huu-ay-aht First Nations
  - 10 ITHA - Inter Tribal Health Authority
  - 11 Kayuk't'/Chektles7et'h' Nation
  - 12 Kwakiutl Band Council - Health
  - 13 Kwikwasut'inuxw Haxwa'mis First Nations
  - 14 Kyuquot First Nation
  - 15 Ministry of Justice
  - 16 Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General - Victoria
  - 17 Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General-Nanaimo
  - 18 Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction
  - 19 Nuchatlaht Tribe
  - 20 Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council
  - 21 Nuu-Chah-nulth Tribal Council; Usma Nuu-chah-nulth Family & Child Services
  - 22 Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations
  - 23 Tsewulhtun Health Centre
  - 24 Ucluelet First Nation
  - 25 Wei Wai Kum First Nations

**WILSON'S TRANSPORTATION  
SOLUTION FOR CONTINUING ESSENTIAL BUSING FOR FIRST NATIONS AND SMALL  
COMMUNITIES AND FIRST NATIONS  
FOR DISCUSSION WITH MINISTER FLEMING, JANUARY 18, 2021**

**The Public Safety Risk:**

Intercity bus service provides the **same essential service as public transit**. It takes people to medical appointments, essential work, school, childcare and to get their prescriptions and groceries. It is particularly critical for those with low income and in remote communities.

On Vancouver Island, **twenty-nine communities** are served with intercity busing by Wilson's **Tofino Bus** and **Vancouver Island Connector** (see attachment). Many of these communities are small, isolated communities with no other transportation services.

Wilson's has contracts with **21 First Nations, Tribal Councils and First Nations Health Organizations** (see attachment) on the island to provide essential travel to their members, who have no other means of transportation.

**82,500 riders** on Vancouver Island used Wilson's intercity busing services in 2019.

Due to COVID 19 work and travel restrictions, revenue on these routes has been **down 95% since March, 2020**. The service was **suspended on December 7<sup>th</sup>** due to public health orders. Wilson's would like to **restart it on February 12<sup>th</sup>** but **will be unable to do so unless it has an adequate source of revenue**. The federal COVID related subsidies and grants are inadequate to operate this service.

If this essential service is permanently cancelled by Wilson's, these **communities will turn to the Minister of Transportation to provide the service**. BC Transit is being subsidized by the federal and provincial government in recognition that busing is an essential service and that there is a 60% drop in riders and loss of fare revenue.

In addition, when intercity bus routes were cancelled by Greyhound, the BC and federal government stepped in to create and fund **BC Bus North** and service along **Highway 16** through BC Transit in recognition of the **public safety risk** created by the loss of bus service.

Wilson's planned to transition to **electric buses** for this service using the **CleanBC** subsidy but cannot do so with no revenue.

**The Solution:**

To avoid the **disruption, cost and public safety risk** created by cancelling intercity busing on Vancouver Island, Wilson's is requesting a **one-year emergency COVID recovery contract with the Ministry to continue this essential service until ridership is restored**.

This solution will **prevent a gap in service** for these communities, it will **avoid government having to take on the long-term cost** of intercity busing on the island and it will ensure Wilson's Transportation is still around to serve these communities during **economic recovery** from COVID 19.

Wilson's is flexible with regard to the terms and conditions of an emergency COVID recovery contract for this essential service. The contract must cover the **operating costs** of this essential service as described in the attachment. Wilson's would then submit all fares to government and as ridership recovers the cost of the contract to government would decline. Wilson anticipates being **fully recovered by early 2022** and no longer in need of this assistance.

Wilson's looks forward to working productively with you to save this essential service for island communities and First Nations.



**VI Connector and Tofino Bus**  
**Serviced Communities**

Victoria	Qualicum Bay
Saanich	Fanny Bay
View Royal	Buckley Bay
Langford	Union Bay
Mill Bay	Royston
Cobble Hill	Courtenay
Cowichan Bay	Merville
Duncan	Black Creek
Chemainus	Oyster River
Ladysmith	Campbell River
Nanaimo – South	Coombs
Nanaimo - Central	Whiskey Creek
Nanaimo - North	Port Alberni
Parksville	Ucluelet
Qualicum Beach	Tofino

**Tofino Bus Services Inc.**  
**Sales by Customer Summary**  
**January - December 2019**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Clients</b>
1	Ahousaht Band Council
2	Alberni Clayoquot
3	Ditidaht First Nations
4	Ehattesaht/Chinehkint
5	First Nations Health Authority
6	Gwa'sala-'Nakwaxda'xw Nations
7	Hesquiaht First Nation
8	House of Himwitsa
9	Huu-ay-aht First Nations
10	ITHA - Inter Tribal Health Authority
11	Kayuk't'/Chektles7et'h' Nation
12	Kwakiutl Band Council - Health
13	Kwikwasut'inuxw Haxwa'mis First Nations
14	Kyuquot First Nation
15	Ministry of Justice
16	Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General - Victoria
17	Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General-Nanaimo
18	Ministry of Social Development and Poverty Reduction
19	Nuchatlaht Tribe
20	Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council
21	Nuu-Chah-nulth Tribal Council; Usma Nuu-chah-nulth Family & Child Services
22	Tla-o-qui-aht First Nations
23	Tsewulhtun Health Centre
24	Ucluelet First Nation
25	Wel Wai Kum First Nations



Tofino Bus Cashflow  
2021 Operations Budget

Expenses	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
<b>Fixed Expenses</b>													
Admin Wages	\$ 38,992.07	\$ 38,992.07	\$ 38,992.07	\$ 41,839.90	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 46,206.58	\$ 527,519.49
Rent/Depot Operations	\$ 55,939.83	\$ 55,939.83	\$ 55,939.83	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 53,490.10	\$ 649,230.39
Utilities/Phone...etc	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 36,000.00
Driver Supplies/Software Expenses	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
Business Insurance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000.00
Management Fee	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 20,833.33	\$ 250,000.00
Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,000.00
Benefits-Sunlife	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 30,000.00
Bus Lease Costs	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
Parking	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 654.00	\$ 7,848.00
Bank Fees	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 3,000.00
<b>Variable Expenses</b>													
Fuel	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 25,342.41	\$ 304,108.88
Driver Wages	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 41,753.92	\$ 501,047.04
Advertising/Promotion	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 6,000.00
PPE/Cleaning Budget	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
Vehicle Insurance	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 60,000.00
Moneris Charges	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 9,000.00
Maintenance Expenses	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 240,000.00
Professional Fees	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 18,000.00
Driver Overnight Expenses	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 3,954.17	\$ 47,450.00
Other Expenses	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 30,000.00
<b>Total Expenses</b>	\$ 240,469.73	\$ 240,469.73	\$ 239,520.45	\$ 240,867.83	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 245,234.51	\$ 2,941,203.79



# Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council

AHOUSAHT  
DITIDAHT  
%IHH=ATIS / C\*IINAX=INT  
HESQUIAHT  
HUPACASATH

HUU-AY-AHT  
KA:'YU:'K'T'H'/CHE:K:TLES7ET'H'  
MOWACHAHT/MUCHALAHT  
NUCHATLAHT  
TLA-O-QUI-AHT

TOQUAHT  
TSESHAHT  
UCHUCKLESAHT  
YUU<U%I<%ATH=

P.O. BOX 1383  
PORT ALBERNI, BC  
V9Y 7M2

Tel: 250.724.5757  
Fax: 250.724.2172

January 27, 2021

Minister of Transportation  
Victoria, BC  
Via email Minister.Transportation@gov.bc.ca

Dear Minister Fleming

Re: Bus Service on Vancouver Island

The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council which represents 14 First Nations on the West Coast of Vancouver Island would like to express our support for the continuation of the Tofino Bus and intercity Bus Service on the island.

Covid-19 has taken a great financial toll on transportation services and Wilson Transportation is in need of your financial help in order to survive.

Our members rely on this service to get them to medical appointments, shopping for necessities and other reasons. Without this service, they will be unable to do the essential travel they need to do.

We would like to raise the issue of the safety of our women and girls. They will be hitch hiking to find their way to important appointments. We know that is how many of our women and girls have gone missing and even murdered. We have witnessed this on the Highway of Tears and we know that there is still a number of Nuu-chah-nulth women who are still missing. We must ensure they have safe transportation to get to their essential destinations so we have no more murdered and missing sisters.

We know that if this basic infrastructure is not maintained, it likely will not be there when this pandemic ends and we will be scrambling to get someone else to try and run a service. This is not necessary if you can provide the financial support needed for this service that provides transportation for 21 First Nation communities and a total of 29 communities. Many of our communities are rural and remote and finding an alternative way of providing them transportation would be very difficult.

We are greatly concerned about the loss of this essential service that many of our members rely on. Ending this essential service would create a real hardship to many of our valuable Nuu-chah-nulth members as well as pose a real public health and safety risk.

On behalf of the Nuuchahnulth Nations and its members, we are asking the provincial government to ensure this essential service of intercity busing continues as it is needed now and for the economic recovery of Vancouver Island.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Judith Sayers".

Judith Sayers, C.M  
President

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mariah Charleson".

Mariah Charleson  
Vice President

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 11:27 AM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** Fwd: About the new Cell phone tower

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Date:** Sat., Jan. 30, 2021, 11:22 a.m.  
**Subject:** About the new Cell phone tower  
**To:** <[council@northcowichan.ca](mailto:council@northcowichan.ca)>

Can u put that NOT in our neighborhood??? Seems North Cowichan wants to make Kaspas Road parking lot an industry area in our neighborhood. Cell phone towers and bike school businesses.

What a nightmare.

Cancer rates more than tripled among people living within 400 meters of cell phone towers or antennas, a German study found. Those within 100 meters were exposed to radiation at 100 times normal levels. An Israeli study found risk of cancer quadrupled among people living within 350 meters (1,148 feet) of a cell phone transmitter—and seven out of eight cancer victims were women. Both studies focused only on people who had lived at the same address for many years.

Other studies have found that levels of radiation emitted from cell phone towers can damage cell tissues and DNA, causing miscarriage, suppressing immune function, and causing other health problems.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 12:30 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** Rogers Cell Tower

Dear Mr. Mayor and North Cowichan Council Members; 1. I would like to state my objection to putting a Cell tower near the water towers in the Forest Reserve. There is much evidence against putting these towers near populated areas and this is what you are planning to do . I am sure you can find a less populated area for this if you feel this is necessary , but ask that you reconsider its location . Any Realtor can tell you that many people will walk away from purchasing property if they are aware of a Cell Tower in their neighbourhood . That can not be good for The Properties or the Figgard Development that is under construction now . We will demand a lowering of taxes if this has devalued our homes , which it will if it goes through .

2. While the Mountain Bikers and bike Shops may not like restrictions to driving up into the Properties to park , they are not the ones that have to live with the daily speeding , parking and garbage left behind from this activity. We are the people paying for this , so our input should be listed to , not discarded.

3. I also want to state that I am extremely disappointed in North Cowichan's drastic reduction of public input for future Council meetings . How can you possibly believe you know better than the people that elected you ? You are destroying democracy at the very lowest level of Government . If you do not like input from the people of North Cowichan , you should resign.

Regards

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 3:40 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** Questions about agenda items r/t Public Participation, Cell tower (Mt Tzouhalem), and Kaspa Parking lot congestion

Good afternoon:

I would like to provide some input into the above agenda items as listed in the header above.

1. Public Participation during e-council meetings.

I am concerned that the proposed limitations on public participation will restrict public input pertaining to; 1) current issues and solutions to them, 2) information gathering and education related to these various issues and; 3) accountability as it relates to decisions made. Can you address why this proposal is in place? Also, what process would be put in place to choose which five speakers would be allowed to speak?

2. Cell tower placements on Mount Tzouhalem and Evans Park.

The agenda states that the installations are subject to public approval. I would like to ensure that the public have adequate time to review the literature on the safety, environmental, and esthetic impact such installations would have on the adjacent communities.

3. Kaspa Parking lot congestion.

I ask the council to consider carefully the arguments presented by various groups for ongoing and relatively unrestricted development and access to various biking trails. Though I support the benefits of outdoor fitness activities, many members of these groups do not live locally and may not fully appreciate the impact these

activities have on our community. The arguments for development based on health and well being and economic growth must be carefully measured against the environmental impact on our community. Issues pertaining to local safety, sustainability, infrastructure, and future impact must also be considered.

Finally, I would like to comment on the short notice that community members have received on the above issues, especially the one pertaining the proposed cell tower development. This is not an insignificant issue, and we would be better served if these proposals could reach the impacted community in a more timely manner.

Thank you for your response,

Regards,

[REDACTED]

FIPPA s. 22(1)

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 3:53 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Cc:** Council  
**Subject:** Comment re: February 2nd MNC Council Meeting on Report re Finalizing the Climate Action and Energy Plan (CAEP)

Dear Municipality of North Cowichan Council,

In North Cowichan's award-winning 2013 CAEP "enforcing urban containment boundaries and increasing housing density" was a top evidence-based recommended action – both from the perspective of cost savings and of highest impact on emissions reductions. The current literature on effective emissions reduction measures continues to reinforce this as one of the most important directions for community planning and development.

Based on this existing evidence, I do not understand how the February 2, 2021 Report to Council Re: "Finalizing the Climate Action and Energy Plan (CAEP) - Model Update" can say that "concentrating housing in existing areas" is both low impact and medium cost as described in Table 1 on Page 9 under Land Use, given that the evidence of this as an important and effective remedy has only gotten stronger since 2013.

It seems the report writers believe that electric vehicles are going to solve all of the municipality's emissions challenges, when in fact the uptake of electric cars is something the municipality has little control over. The direction of our federal and provincial governments on EVs is primarily incentive-based and BC's ban on sales of fossil-fuel-powered vehicles is too far in the future to meet current science-based emission reduction targets. Many people in our Cowichan Valley communities cannot afford to switch to an EV any time soon, even with current incentives. Some cannot afford a car at all. E-bikes and e-scooter are much more affordable, so uptake of these may move faster and should be part of the mix. Creating connected trails for their use is less expensive for the municipality than building and maintaining more roads, yet this is all far down your list. And compact neighborhoods close to services will most broadly serve people's needs, regardless of income, which also reducing emissions.

I've driven an electric car for a few year now, charge it at home and can't even remember the last time I've used a public charging station. I think these are good things to have and I doubt that more of them will have the impact you are imagining, so for many reasons I have to question the report's assumptions in this area.

The evidence shows that land use planning focused on housing densification near existing centres with existing services remains important in reducing emissions at the municipal level. And until we build more compact and well planned neighborhoods near services, the cost to the municipality of maintaining the infrastructure needed to service spread-out suburban developments will remain high.

Amending building codes to increase energy efficiency in new construction is also critical, and if we don't move to BC Step Code 5 soon, the cost of upgrading the energy efficiency of existing housing stock is going to be higher than it needs to be. I am glad to see you've "energy efficient low carbon buildings" rated "high emissions reduction and likely net saving".

Thank you for your time and this opportunity to provide input.

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
Cowichan Bay, BC

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)



*I acknowledge with gratitude and respect the traditional and unceded territory of the Quw'utsun people who have, for thousands of years, cared for this land where I have the privilege to live and work.*

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 11:02 AM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** Kasper parking over crowding/Businesses

It's not just lessons for the children, it's lessons for adults too. The bike teachers are bringing too many people at once. Please ask them to go to anywhere else on weekends. They use the lot during the week and that's fine. The weekends have become horrible and not nice to live here any more. That's why some have moved away. There are many places to ride that is not in someone's subdivision.

We need that other lot built so we can encourage the bike teachers to add that one as one of their options. The fellow from NEXT level riding is from Europe and perhaps doesn't know there are other places to teach people to mountain bike ride. There is Mt Provost, Maple Mt, access Mt Tzouhalem from the firehall, Cobble Hill with a skills park etc.

Also there are no other parking lots for huge parks in someone's neighbourhood. That's the problem, there is a tourist destination right in our small neighborhood, there isn't at other tourist destinations. They were all designed with people thinking about what would happen if it got populated.

I know a couple wise older mountain bike locals that spoke with Don Stewart about how they saw that this very problem would happen if they continued to advertise this neighborhood as a tourist destination.

Well here we are and now with the bike teachers, and they are hating the residents of Kasper Rd and surrounding areas. We residents are being bombarded as if we are living on the side of the road and parking lot of Whistler chair lift.

By the way, there are NO houses by the chair lift my Whistler because of course that would be a poor design. Please build that other parking lot the top of Kingsview as soon as possible and ask the many bike teachers to conduct their businesses not in our small neighborhood.

Thank you.

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 4:57 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Cc:** Don Stewart  
**Subject:** Response to bike schools using Kasper

February 1, 2021

To MNC Council –

I'd like to correct some misunderstandings that seem to be common among the letter writers who have commented in the Agenda Addendum p268 regarding **Item 8.7, Kasper Parking Lot Congestion**.

The common thread in these letters seems to be dislike of restrictions on commercial bike schools using Kasper trailhead. I have talked with many neighbors, and I think there is a consensus that we have nothing against the commercial operations. Further, we have nothing against any of the car, foot or bike traffic for that matter...when well-behaved. These are recreational activities that should be encouraged by MNC.

It is just that there are *too many users* for a residential neighborhood. Constructive solutions are needed.

Parking space is often inadequate for peak demand, even with street parking included. The situation seems likely to worsen as weather improves into summer. This isn't going to be good for anyone, neither trail user visitors nor residents. In particular there are *personal users* who visit for a casual forest walk or bike ride, who are competing for space with the *commercial* operations. Someone will be squeezed out. The parking limitation in the lot and on the nearby road, is a physical reality that supersedes anyone's wishes.

The personal users don't seem to have found a voice for lobbying like the bikers. Nevertheless, we think the many personal trail users who must come by car, appreciate Don Stewart's effort to limit the organized commercial traffic. These limits are needed in the near term until new solutions can be found. We think Mr. Stewart should continue his policy for now.

All the trail users, including the commercial operators, should be encouraged to use other trails. We have Six Mountains. Only one of those mountains has a trailhead in a residential neighborhood!

If Tzouhalem has the *only* trails suited to a wide range of biker experience, as one bike teacher claims, the obvious solution is for Don Stewart to work with Cowichan Trail Stewardship Society (or others) to create a suitable range of trails on other mountains. This is an objective stated in the official trails plan, so let's get on with it. We would be happy to see the bikers and their teachers having a good time, but please, direct the crowd away from Kasper.

The Kasper parking lot was built for the trail users, no one else. When the Kasper parking lot is full, that trailhead should be considered to be "at capacity". The street parking is for residents and their guests. Street parking should never be so filled that Kasper is restricted to one lane, as happens regularly. That is beyond the road's design capacity and becomes dangerous.

We all hope Don Stewart will report an agreement with Transide for a new Tzouhalem trailhead in presently unbuilt land.

For now, direct surplus trailhead traffic elsewhere, by all means available. Some persistent MNC effort may be needed to get users to change their habits and choose other trails, but that should be neither difficult nor expensive, particularly if the bike shops and CTSS help out.

Please put "Residents' Parking Only" signage up, and please enforce it. AND do what is necessary to make enjoyable recreational trails available for all types of users on other mountains.

The Kasper residents want ample recreational solutions for everyone, not daily fights over limited roads and parking.

 FIPPA s. 22(1)  


## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 3:34 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** Bedlam on Kaspas Road

Dear Council Members

I want to express my disappointment on the report submitted by Mr. Stewart, Director of Parks and Recreation. on the Kaspas Parking Lot spill over into the local neighbourhood streets (Kaspas, Chipewa, and Salish).

To summarize - No additional short term solutions were provided, other than to hope that Covid 19 vaccinations will deter usage of the trails.

The Engineering Staff's resistance to "Residential Parking Only" signs is puzzling. As a former resident of Burnaby, living 10 blocks from the PNE, our neighbourhood would be flooded with PNE patron parking for 17 Days every year. Burnaby placed "Residential Parking Only" signs throughout the neighborhood during the PNE, which immediately solved the issue.

There was no registration, and I suspect no enforcement, but it did keep the streets clear. This is not a new problem for a municipality or city, and I suspect a variety of solutions are in use. Burnaby's solution worked - please give this option a chance (or look to other jurisdictions for a different solution). To hope that parking and traffic congestion will go away on its own is not the answer.

The Department of Parks and Recreation created this problem for our neighbourhood by increasing the parking lot and actively promoting the trail system. The popularity of the trail system is not going to diminish. Let's find a solution.

Sincerely Submitted  
Frustrated "Properties at Maple Bay" Home Owner

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 10:22 PM  
**To:** Al Siebring; Christopher Justice; Tek Manhas; Rob Douglas; Debra Toporowski; Rosalie Sawrie; Kate Marsh; Ted Swabey; Rob Conway; Shawn Cator; Engineering; carl.reitsma@northcowichan.ca; Agenda  
**Subject:** Temporary Relaxation of GVW Restriction on Drinkwater Road

6. Mayor Siebring, Council & Staff

Re: 8.9. Temporary Relaxation of No Heavy Truck Route on Drinkwater Road 275 - 278

6. Purpose: To consider relaxing the “no heavy trucks” restriction on Drinkwater Road during the construction of the new RCMP facility.

Recommendation:

Notwithstanding Council’s resolution of May 5, 2010 to designate a portion of Drinkwater Road, between Ford Road and Highway 18, as a no heavy truck route, that Council authorizes the use of Drinkwater Road between Ford Road and Highway 18 by heavy trucks for the purpose of hauling materials to and from the municipal pit located on Drinkwater Road to the location of the RCMP facility between February 3, 2021 and project completion or as determined by the Director of Engineering.

As residents of Somenos and Drinkwater Roads, we are writing to voice our objections to the Municipality approving the 'Temporary Relaxation of Heavy Trucks on Drinkwater Road.'

While we understand the thought process that this would be the shortest route we are very concerned at the impact this will have on our neighbourhoods. The increased volume, speed and noise along this road has steadily increased over the past few years and we feel this is the last thing the neighbourhood needs to contend with. The West portion of Drinkwater Rd. already has traffic calming measures in place which would cause unnecessary noise for the local residents from accelerating and decelerating ( brake and engine noise ) heavy trucks. As well , every truck and trailer would have to navigate a traffic circle not designed for industrial traffic. The East portion of Drinkwater Rd. has a higher number of residential homes which would also be greatly affected by the truck traffic. As well the trucks would have another traffic circle to negotiate at the intersection of Drinkwater and Lane Rds.

The existing route East on Highway 18 to Highway, 1 then south to Paddle Rd or Drinkwater Rd are already legal and designed for truck traffic. While this route does take a few minutes longer it would have a lesser impact on residential areas as well as less wear and tear on roads and traffic circles not built for heavy traffic. Using this already legal route would not require any changes to existing rules and would have almost no impact on residential taxpayers safety and quality of life as the project is constructed.

We urge the Municipality to not allow this 'temporary relaxation' to be passed.

Due to the short notice that the residents have had of this upcoming motion ,as well as the restrictions that Covid has imposed , some of the residents on Drinkwater Rd could not be notified, however the majority of the residents contacted have requested to have their names added to this letter . There are a number of others that have chosen to write to Mayor and Council individually.

Sincerely,

FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Somenos Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Somenos Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Somenos Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd
FIPPA s. 22(1)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] Drinkwater Rd

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 4:49 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Cc:** Al Siebring; Rob Douglas; Christopher Justice; Tek Manhas; Kate Marsh; Rosalie Sawrie; Debra Toporowski; Ted Swabey; David Conway; Clay Reitsma; Rob Conway  
**Subject:** Item 8.9 NO Heavy Trucks on Drinkwater Rd !!

Item 8.9 Temporary Relaxation of No Heavy Truck Route on Drinkwater Rd. 🤔

Absolutely Not !!!

Purpose: To consider relaxing the " no heavy trucks " restriction on Drinkwater Rd.

Why hasn't North Cowichan notified Residents along Drinkwater RD ?? of this idea

- to haul loads from (Regional) RCMP building on farmland to Muni gravel pit at North Rd. along narrow, Rural Heritage Road (Historic Mclure House) now with Speed Humps - for a good reason- excess traffic, speeding, RV's, 5th Wheels, boats on trailers, cut thru' to Lake Cowichan Hwy 18, Farms, Animals, Farm Equipment, CVRD pedestrian Trail Crossing ..... Drinkwater Road - west end is too narrow and dangerous !!

Traffic Count on Drinkwater Rd if done at a low traffic time – not realistic ##'s

RCMP building site can {as everyone else must} have Heavy trucks use the Proper Route along Hwy 18 to North Rd to gravel pit - a few mins. extra and Leave Drinkwater Rd alone !! It took more than 25 yrs to finally make the narrow, country Drinkwater road Safer with Speed Humps !! Muni put 2 ' Local Traffic Only' signs -past the roundabout on Drinkwater Rd west - too late to turn around – same problem on sign end near Hwy 18 -too late to turn if not knowing or bothering with the North Rd connector by golf course.

The restrictions of Heavy trucks for –'avoiding the scales ' was MNC's excuse ??

not the residents many concerns along Drinkwater Rd. Since when does a municipal government feel responsible for Provincial scales check on a municipal road ?

Dump Trucks loaded turning left into the gravel pit with traffic speeding over Drinkwater Rd hill between North Roads will be extra dangerous .

An irresponsible, uncaring suggestion re: Heavy Trucking – Buses, Ambulances Delivery trucks all busy along the east end of Drinkwater Rd as a mini freeway .....

extra busy come summer months as now used as a regular route to and from Lake Cowichan including Tim Horton's delivery trucks .....

MNC did not bother to \$ave \$\$\$ when you \$pent \$1.2 Million extra to purchase an added 2 acres with an unnecessary house plus \$1 Million in 2014 for 3 acres hayfield.

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)



## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 4:19 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Cc:** al.seibring@northcowichan.ca; Rob Douglas; Christopher Justice; Tek Manhas; Kate Marsh; Rosalie Sawrie; Debra Toporowski; Ted Swabey; Clay Reitsma; Rob Conway  
**Subject:** Relaxing the "no heavy trucks" restriction on Drinkwater Rd during construction of the new RCMP facility.

To Mayor & Council:

I live on Drinkwater Rd and am greatly concerned that the Municipality is considering driving heavy-duty trucks down a country road, such as Drinkwater. There are many reasons **not** to do this:

- it is a **safety issue**: there is no sidewalk along our road and, since COVID, there are dozens of people who use the road for their daily walks with their pets. As it is a very narrow country road, there would be significant safety issues for the community-at-large if heavy machinery began using this side road.
- this is a **farm road**: the traffic from heavy trucks would **dramatically** impact the livestock within yards (sometimes feet) of the road between Highway 18 and Somenos Rd. The noise of 600 loaded dump trucks going over multiple speed bumps and then rattling back 600 times over those same 'traffic calming' humps will be significant and will **most certainly affect the animals** that are housed there. In a time when food security is paramount to our community, impacting its production is a poor decision.
- Particularly because the gravel yard is a **stone's throw away** from Highway 18, there is easy access to that highway, and the added mileage for hauling the gravel is negligible when compared to the impact on farms and food.

I am perplexed why our neighbourhood was not informed about an issue that would have such dramatic impact on it. I'm sure non-farmers are probably thinking that this is only temporary, and therefore wouldn't be that much of an impingement on livestock. But they would be very mistaken. We are heading into spring, when the raising of livestock is at its peak and farms are most active. Therefore, these farms will be most affected by **1200 heavy-duty trucks going by their livestock**. This dramatic impact is the reason the restrictions were implemented by the Municipality in the first place.

Thank you for considering my input. I am sure, given the opportunity, you would have heard from many of the neighbouring farms expressing similar sentiments.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

Feb 1, 2021

To Be read at the Council meeting Feb 3, 2021

Re: Lifting of the weight restrictions on Drinkwater Rd.

My husband and I have discussed this. If it is just to be lifted to facilitate the construction of the new RCMP building and other construction at that end of the road we see no problem. Will it be reinstated at a set time? If you cannot give us this then the answer would be No! We feel that other businesses would take advantage of the lifting and cause an already narrow road to be dangerous. We feel it would be a hazard for hikers trying to access the trail, There is no safe place on either side of the road to walk.

FIPPA s. 22(1)

## Ginny Gemmell

---

**From:** [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 2:30 PM  
**To:** Agenda  
**Subject:** re: Heavy truck usage on Drinkwater Rd  
**Attachments:** Letter to Municipality Mayor and Council January 31^LJ 2021.docx

Hello, please find attached my letter for the viewing of the Mayor and Council for consideration. Thank you. [REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

[REDACTED] FIPPA s. 22(1)

## To the Mayor and Council of the Municipality of North Cowichan

Regarding your agenda Item “No Heavy Truck Route” as follows:

*8.9. Temporary Relaxation of No Heavy Truck Route on Drinkwater Road 275 - 278 Purpose: To consider relaxing the “no heavy trucks” restriction on Drinkwater Road during the construction of the new RCMP facility. Recommendation: Notwithstanding Council’s resolution of May 5, 2010 to designate a portion of Drinkwater Road, between Ford Road and Highway 18, as a no heavy truck route, that Council authorizes the use of Drinkwater Road between Ford Road and Highway 18 by heavy trucks for the purpose of hauling materials to and from the municipal pit located on Drinkwater Road to the location of the RCMP facility between February 3, 2021 and project completion or as determined by the Director of Engineering.*

Please consider not approving this recommendation for the usage of Drinkwater Rd. for heavy trucks for the purpose of hauling materials to and from the municipal pit and the new RCMP facility. As you know, the residents of Drinkwater Rd. have, over the years, tirelessly lobbied the municipality to limit traffic on our portion of Drinkwater RD. (west of Somenos Rd.). As it is, there is still much traffic, including heavy vehicles that “sneak” down the road.

This portion of Drinkwater Rd. is narrow. Some of the residents on this portion of the road are active farmers. These farmers have slow moving, wide, tractors and implements. I feel that allowing heavy trucks to make many, many trips a day along this road will be problematic (competing for road space with farm vehicles), and perhaps dangerous (to slow moving farm vehicles entering and exiting farm gates) and bring unwanted noise and activity to our country peace. This is also a “walkers” road and we have the CVRD Trail entrances and exits to be considered, both which are used by cyclists, walkers, runners, and equestrians.

We are very appreciative of the municipal past response to our concerns by putting in speed humps, which work well in curbing speed on the road. We are also appreciative for the signage designating this road a “local” and clear signage of farm vehicle usage, and no heavy vehicle use.

As the recommendation does not clearly define an end date to this altered use of the road, agreeing with this recommendation would be going backwards regarding this heritage roads usage and the great measures you have taken to preserve it.

May I respectfully suggest that the Trans-Canada Highway and Highway 18 are both more appropriate routes as these highways are designed to take heavy trucks. There would only be a few minutes added to their route and no resident of Drinkwater Rd. west or east would be inconvenienced or unduly aggravated.

With sincerity,

██████████, Resident of Drinkwater Rd. (west portion between Somenos Rd and Highway

18) FIPPA s. 22(1)