

Township of Langley Candidates Answers to YWES Environmental Questions

1. What is the one best thing you could do while in office to directly help our Watersheds and Environment?
 - **Alex Joehl:** The best way to protect something is to monetize it. Water purity, water levels, and air quality are all very quantifiable, and any developer, home owner, or business owner found guilty of causing such damage (sometimes irreparable) will be punished financially, criminally, or both. I am all in favour of looking for new opportunities to develop the Township for residential, commercial, and industrial needs, but it doesn't need to come at the expense of our water sources and air quality.
 - **Anna Remenik:** In 2014 I did significant research into the Brookwood aquifer. Most of the studies I found went back to 2005, some as far back as 2001. Much has changed since then. We need a comprehensive hydrological study of the Township aquifers, indicating current water levels and noting any recent contamination from new development, amongst other things. This should definitely be done in advance of any further development in the Brookwood/Fernridge area, in order to ensure we are protecting our aquifers, and the multi-billion-dollar farm industry dependent upon them. Reports of well contamination in the Willoughby area should also be investigated. Evolving provincial groundwater protection legislation may result in future legal action against the Township, and we have the moral and ethical responsibility to do our due diligence now.
 - **Petrina Arnason:** In my last term, I was very proactive in ensuring that ISWMP's were implemented, on a priority basis, in order to maintain and protect the health of our waterways and habitat as we continue to develop. Unfortunately, the West Creek watershed plan proposal that I put forward was not undertaken as a result of staff feedback regarding development in the Gloucester Industrial area, which was calculated at below the recommended threshold of 20% identified as necessary to trigger the plan. I personally feel that we should not wait for a re-development application for the currently zoned "golf course" lands in Gloucester Industrial Estates as it is vital that we have reliable, and holistic, scientific information regarding the impacts on the West Creek area and the salmon habitat from further industrial development. Having the necessary information in place prior to specific decision making will also help to guide sound environmental management and balance the interests in order to meet the criteria of sustainable development under our "Sustainable Development Charter."
 - **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** I believe that ongoing, respectful dialogue with local environmental groups with expertise and interests in a wide variety of local concerns would ensure the Council has input regarding environmentally sensitive issues prior to land sales, reviewing the removal of lands from the ALR or approval of development permits. A survey of all TOL held lands would be a good place to being a review of current assets and a focal point for initiating discussions.
 - **Michelle Connerty:** The one best thing I could do either in office or out is be become more involved by listening, attending meetings and learning about our watersheds and environmental issues. I have some ideas of where the needs are, but I could definitely be

much better educated about all the sensitive areas within the Township. I care deeply for the environment and know how important protecting and managing our sensitive resources is.

- **David Davis:** The one thing I will do is to continue to advocate and bring awareness to our environment and watersheds. We need to support all environmental groups and do not allow development to comprise our environment and watersheds.
- **Bev Dornan:** Continue to support the environmental partners in steam clean up, removal of invasive species, protecting steam set backs, and also monitor pollution and environmental hazards that are leaching into our stream.
- **Steve Ferguson:** Protection of our watersheds through our coded streams system Working with Ministry of Environment (Provincially) and Ministry of Fisheries (federally) to ensure policy and standards are being met
- **Gary Hee:** I have been instrumental in the establishment of the non-profit society named "ABC Wild Fire Prevention & Watch Society" which has a mandate to prevent wild fires from destroying forest and communities following the Fort McMurray and record wild fire season in BC.
- **Jonathan Houweling:** My first thought is to increase penalties for careless polluters. Second, support new developments which have plenty of EV plug in reservations. Third, immediately introduce a cannabis odour by-law requiring compliance by all new and existing commercial operations. Fourth, I would like a basic assessment on the Willoughby slope aquifer to see how and if the spread of methane filled liquid manure from the dairy farm there has affected it over the years.
- **Margaret Kunst:** To support the amazing work that organizations like yours and others are doing to make us more aware and educating us on how we can better protect our Watersheds and Environment.
- **Bob Long:** Council must be ever diligent in its decisions to make sure that environmental issues are addressed - working closely and in partnership with groups such as those mentioned here is an excellent practice that I hope will continue.
- **Angie Quaale:** Ensure that our municipality is current, innovative and always looking at ways to improve the good work we are already doing. Enhancing our support and partnerships with community groups like LEPS and YSES.
- **Kim Richter:** In my opinion, the one best thing I could do in office to help watersheds is to protect more trees and riparian setbacks. Second to that is to stop the "blending" of water in the Township which draws down our local aquifers especially during the summer months.
- **Kerri Ross:** Create a civic plan for development around waterways that helps offset the gap between the Federal / Provincial/ Municipal regulations changes from the last 5 - 10 years.
- **Craig Teichrieb:** I think the best approach to protecting our watersheds and environment is to isolate key forested land, and areas close to our waterways and streams and protect them from development before we go ahead with any OCP. And ensure proper water

management plans are in place to identify changes to water runoff once an area is developed.

- **Stacey Wakelin:** I firmly believe this answer is quite simple. We need to view environmental concerns as a priority and a crisis we need to address. I would like to see the TOL become a leader in addressing climate change. Let's start off on the right foot by taking an environmental inventory of sorts what we have, what is critical need, etc. With so much knowledge in our very own community, we need to listen, learn and take action needed.
- **Blair Whitmarsh:** The TOL is required to protect the environment as mandated by Provincial regulations. However, I think we must continue to ensure that our environment is protected in our official community plans and neighborhood plans (currently beginning the process on three neighborhood plans in the Brookwood-Fernridge area).
- **Harold Whittell:** Support the many groups we have Township wide with some moderate funding to help with their work and to allow them to get their message out. Be a strong voice representing their positions.
- **Eric Woodward:** I want to ensure the retention of more real mature trees during the development process, especially in Willoughby, which we all know is not happening (and won't happen in Fernridge either). There is no reason we can't do a better job here, with some real direction to staff from Council. Up to now that has not been possible, without an environmental majority. If I get elected with a few others, I hope that changes. We need some of these trees to get at least some water back in to the ground as we replace a lot of the remainder of the Willoughby with impervious cover, in conjunction with not pursuing 1980s style development, like we are even in Williams, for example. We need more pervious cover after development, with some better, mixed-use development that is not auto-orientated, but more balanced in terms of real design, it not density reductions. I want to change the culture in that regard, hopefully we have a majority to do that. I have more to learn here, though. By reducing the auto-orientated design we are still pursuing here in Langley, we can reduce the congestion, and change the lifestyles we are designing for. We are still stuck in the 1980s, and it needs to change. And as a small 2nd, I would like to see more developers be environmentally responsible, such as my LEED Gold project in Fort Langley, with some incentives for that. This kind of energy use reduction and better design cumulatively adds up to a lot over time, especially over decades.

2. What is your position on a tree bylaw for the Township of Langley?

- **Alex Joehl:** I agree that there could be a bylaw put in place to control damage to the landscape. However, as a property rights advocate, I could not support any bylaw that didn't give landowners some avenue for tree removal. Some onus needs to be put on the neighbourhood to prove why it should not be removed. If a property owner applied to remove trees from their land, only a few reasons, like irrigation issues, the health of other root systems, and influence on other trees in the area would be able to hold back the removal. "It makes the neighbourhood lose its character" isn't a reason to stop the removal.

- **Anna Remenik:** I started a petition in 2014 in favour of a Tree Bylaw for Brookwood Fernridge, and advocated persistently, until an Interim Tree Clear Cutting bylaw (No. 5030) was adopted in 2014. This bylaw was replaced in 2017, when current Mayor and Council approved the 2017 Brookwood/Fernridge OCP, leaving the developed part of Brookwood unprotected yet again. In some cases, we have seen removal of all trees on lots formerly dotted with numerous mature trees. In 2018, I also presented to Mayor and Council requesting a Township Wide Tree bylaw, along with other delegations, such as Catherine Grey and Hanae Sakuri, also in favour.
- **Petrina Arnason:** I support the protection and enhancement of our tree canopy as a “best management” practice similar to policies and regulations in our neighbouring Metro communities. In light of the ongoing discussions regarding a draft Tree Bylaw that were referred to a future Council a few months ago, I brought forward a Notice of Motion to implement an interim bylaw similar to the protocols enacted when the Brookwood/Fernridge OCP was under active discussion. Unfortunately, the majority on Council did not support this measure. In the meantime, I have been actively engaged with a number of stewardship stakeholders in order to provide input on draft provisions that will be helpful once the new Council outlines its priorities.
- **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** I support a tree bylaw that address tree protection in all areas, currently developed as well as undeveloped areas.
- **Michelle Connerty:** I believe we need a Township wide tree bylaw (for the non-ALR lands) immediately. I had a delegation before Council in the Spring of 2018 asking for a by-law to be implemented immediately after learning that the interim by-law in Brookwood/Fernridge had been replaced by a permanent by-law that only included the undeveloped areas of Brookwood/Fernridge. We are one of only very few municipalities in the Lower Mainland area that do not have such a by-law and we are long overdue!
- **David Davis:** We need a tree bylaw and I have been very vocal about supporting one. However we need to make sure we take into consideration our ALR land..... BUT be very clear and enforce consequences on removal of trees with no intentions of farming like Tara Farms.
- **Bev Dornan:** We need to protect the clear cutting of trees prior to development. We need to balance the needs of owners with the protection of trees. I would be in favor of a bylaw that mitigates the rights of owners with the protection of trees, while protection them against clear cutting
- **Steve Ferguson:** Have protected areas for parks and Watershed areas
- **Gary Hee:** Selected trees either need to be pruned away from power lines, topped to avoid toppling onto structures inline of fall, or cut back to avoid fall leaves from plugging up storm drains that cause backup and flooding.
- **Jonathan Houweling:** I support a by-law. I would like it to recognize private property rights however, and function in harmony with community priorities.
- **Margaret Kunst:** I understand there is a process in place where council will be consulting with the community to find out what the community wants to do in regards to a tree

bylaw. I have spoken with people who live in the ALR and urban areas and they have differing opinions about what the tree bylaw should look like. If elected will be listening carefully as I believe it's important to preserve our trees but also respect landowners and the decisions they make with their land.

- **Bob Long:** I supported creating a bylaw, and I still would like to see it brought about - keeping in mind the large amounts of ALR in the Township. Also we should look to other jurisdictions for ideas.
- **Angie Quaale:** I will support a planned bylaw that has had the opportunity for community consultation. I expect a tree bylaw will come forward early into the new council term and I will very much look forward to hearing from our community about its implications.
- **Kim Richter:** I have long supported and advocated for a Township-wide Tree Protection Bylaw. I continue to strongly support having such a bylaw.
- **Kerri Ross:** We should have one. There have been no ill effects on other municipalities that have them and they are still viable cities that enjoy growth.
- **Craig Teichrieb:** I believe we need a tree bylaw that covers all to the Township of Langley.
Stacey Wakelin: Desperately needed. Let's look to other communities and begin > to develop one that protects our resources.
- **Blair Whitmarsh:** I do love trees and chose to live in Brookwood partly because of the beautiful trees throughout the area. I am supportive of a tree bylaw that has been built on good public consultation and that creates a balance between the rights of private land ownership and the rights of those that live within the area of that property. I do support a tree bylaw that is for the entire Township (excluding ALR) and not just limited to one area of Langley. The current council expressed that the topic of a tree bylaw be a priority item in the new term.
- **Harold Whittell:** Fully support. Would work to include a "smart tree retention" component to allow developers to consider tree retention before they get too far along in their planning.
- **Eric Woodward:** I have proposed a tree protection bylaw as part of my platform, and committed to propose and fight for one. It is long overdue, as we are starting to see replacement of older homes in Brookwood and Fort Langley, especially. I released that a few weeks ago in a speech I have on Brookwood/Fernridge, where I want to advocate for a "reset" there. I also did a shorter video. I have linked them all here:
<https://www.ericwoodward.com/speeches> <https://www.ericwoodward.com/platform>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6rd66A77pco>The last one is a direct link to where I commit to a tree protection bylaw. I mention Surrey's as an example, to not make it sound too scary, but it can be customized for Langley. Either way, it has to get done, in my opinion. I want to restructure the way mature trees are handled, in terms of sharing the "burden" amongst developers. We need to change that model, so there is little economic need to remove them. There is why where my development experience is badly needed on Council, to reform the process, and find the right balance, where trees go from a political football to a component they work on, like anything else. There is no reason most can't get what they want, we just have to try.

3. We are finding that more environmental staff are needed to ensure a healthy community. What will you do to increase staff time dedicated to conserving our local environment and enforcing our existing bylaws?

- **Anna Remenik:** Ensure the fines are adequate to support the cost of the Bylaw enforcement and apply the enforcement evenly and consistently.
- **Petrina Arnason:** Although the Township has a number of policies and regulations with respect to waterways, as well as riparian protection protocols as available to local government, I believe that we are often challenged with respect to resource implementation due to scarce resources and competing demands. This is most particularly true of activities that may take place in off times such as evenings and weekends, where characteristically this important oversight and regulatory function does not have enough available staff to draw upon. I believe that it is therefore necessary to review this policy area in order to develop a framework at budgetary discussion in order to ensure adequate coverage through the potential hiring of further, dedicated staff, to work in this critical area.
- **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** I am willing to review the staffing currently in place and to add more as appropriate. I hear from many residents regarding the dumping of garbage, the dumping of waste on ALR lands, trash in local streams – this needs to be addressed and I am sure additional staffing would be of great assistance.
- **David Davis:** I would like to see a committee similar to what the Township of Langley has now for their Advisory Committees. Each environmental group would send a representative from their society to meet bi-monthly with a Council member (who sits on the committee) and Township staff. This committee would act as a liaison to all the environment groups and Mayor and Council. You need a strong environmental committed council to uphold the bylaws.
- **Steve Ferguson:** Designated watersheds
- **Bob Long:** Solutions to this need to be discussed with department heads at budget time.
- **Kim Richter:** I think we need a dedicated Bylaw Officer who focuses only on environmental issues and who proactively monitors all development and fill sites. This position would need extensive environmental training and qualifications.
- **Kerri Ross:** In a sustainable frame work there is a balance between 3 factors encompassed in Growth/Development, Social and Environment. We have a number of Planners that oversee Growth/Development and now one Social yet no Environmental. This is an extremely imbalanced approach and we should have people in place to influence Environmental interests and long term viability of the Townships Eco Capital.
- **Blair Whitmarsh:** I am not familiar with the total number of environmental staff at the TOL. It is a question that I will ask at the start of the new term.
- **Harold Whittell:** If we are able to have a tree bylaw enacted, there would be at least 1-2 new staff required which will give more time to all environmental matters in the process. I believe the additional staff will be paid for through tree permits etc, a win win.

4. Integrated Stormwater Management Plans (ISMPs) are studies of a whole watershed including groundwater resources. ISMPs are required for watersheds in Metro Vancouver that are impacted by more than 20% development. What is your stand on developing ISMP's for all of Langley's watersheds regardless of the current or projected percentage of development?
- **Anna Remenik:** Our watersheds are intertwined and connected throughout the Township. We must incorporate all areas into these reports in order to ensure we are proceeding with a complete picture provided by the best science available today. How can you plan responsibly without that?
 - **Petrina Arnason:** I believe that the Township should have a timeframe through which budgetary resources are made available to finish all of the ISMP's in a timely manner. I have been an advocate for a "user pay" system to co-fund the plans as a fair, and transparent way, to assess costs to those primarily benefitting. In the event that the development is more diffuse, it may be advisable that those within the area wishing to develop would pay a modest amount into a fund in order to reduce the burden on our taxpayers and support the principle that growth should pay for itself.
 - **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** The more I learn about ISMPs the more I like the concept. I would start with watershed areas where development is projected to ensure proper management plans are in place prior to development approval and then spread out to watershed areas which are currently not at risk of development.
 - **David Davis:** I think that having storm water management plans in place is a good idea for all big development. I am concerned about how it would impact single families on a single lot.... if they are building a home. Is that affordable?? We need to definitely look into this further.
 - **Steve Ferguson:** Regional, Provincial, and Federal lands designated where appropriate for Watershed protection. We have approx.. 5 Regional parks, we also have provincial (unzoned lands), that could be proportioned for Watershed protection, Finally The CFB Aldergrove and the 1100 acres on that site, some which could be protected Watersheds.
 - **Bob Long:** Integrated Stormwater Management Plans (ISMPs) are studies of a whole watershed including groundwater resources. ISMPs are required for watersheds in Metro Vancouver that are impacted by more than 20% development. What is your stand on developing ISMP's for all of Langley's watersheds regardless of the current or projected percentage of development? This was recently discussed at council and I think developing ISMP's should be put on the agenda for discussion at a council priorities early in the new term.
 - **Kim Richter:** I believe ISMPs are required for all the watersheds in Langley Township due to the importance and extent of our fish-bearing streams. Council should be enforcing this.
 - **Kerri Ross:** I was surprised to read that the language of the Township of Langley's ISMP's Plan Outline differed from the guide for Metro Vancouver. The Metro Vancouver (and standard "textbook" framework) of "Integrated Stormwater Management Plans, or ISMPs, are comprehensive studies that examine the linkages between drainage servicing, land use planning and environmental protection. Their purpose is to support the growth of a community in a way that maintains or ideally enhances the overall health of a watershed."

differs from the Township stance that " ISMP integrates land use, stormwater management, and environmental values to direct future activities in each Township watershed, where significant development is expected to take place." I think this creates an inherently problematic issue that the watersheds are not bound by the areas undergoing development and could in fact span multiple areas either in the process of, pending or having been developed and this therefore could miss critical impact points. I think we need to evaluate how we look at and approach ISMP's

- **Blair Whitmarsh:** I would support the current requirement for ISMP. We have limited resources and the 20% standard seems like an appropriate high standard when we have limited resources and our primary source of income is property taxes.
- **Harold Whittell:** I think we are lacking teeth in this area. I know in Gloucester they are just under the 20% threshold and the main developer has resisted doing a comprehensive ISMP, as have the TOL.

5. Our farmland needs to be preserved for a sustainable future. What is your position on preserving and possibly expanding the land in the Township of Langley dedicated to food production?

- **Anna Remenik:** No land exclusions from the ALR. Protect our aquifers. Encourage land matching with young farmers to get more farmland back into production. Monitor and enforce landfill bylaws - No toxic fill on arable land. Industrial greenhouses should be in industrial areas without arable soil. Explore incentives and penalties in tax structure - possibly additional taxes on ALR land that has been purchased and permitted to go fallow, or reduce taxes for someone specifically for participating in the land-matching program We need to do our due diligence and conduct a study on our aquifers now. If that study indicates the aquifer cannot sustain development, then Fernridge property should be given Estate zoning to meet the needs of that market without impacting on ALR land. Fernridge land could also stay zoned for hobby farms as well and be used in land matching to further contribute to food production. I know this opens up the whole OCP issue again, but this is work that should have been done long ago, and it is not prudent to proceed with the 2017 OCP in absence of knowing the long-term implications on the aquifer, using the science we have available today.
- **Petrina Arnason:** I have been a staunch advocate for farmland conservation and protection for many years and have elaborated on my position on my election website at www.petrinaarnason.com. During my time on Council, I have not forwarded a number of applications to the ALC, which were in my view, not in keeping with our local government mandate to protect our farmlands and that were fundamentally incompatible with the principles of the Township's Agricultural Strategy, from my perspective. And finally, I have been very proactive in working with members of the agricultural community to consider enhanced opportunities for more economic diversification and opportunities for farm gates and other expanded income streams to support farming viability in the Township.
- **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** I totally agree with the preservation of farmland for food production and protection of all ALR. As 75% of our land mass is currently in the ALR I would need to understand which lands are in your consideration. Parcels of land existing as

'rural' or forested and the official plans designating lands as rural could potentially be protected by a designation of 'farmlands'.

- **David Davis:** We need land to produce food. The best way to preserve farmland is to farm it. We should not send applications to the ALR for land removal just because the application fits the Township criteria. Another way to preserve farmland is not allowing Marijuana to be grown on Farmland it takes away from the potential to grow food.
 - **Bob Long:** Our farmland needs to be preserved for a sustainable future. What is your position on preserving and possibly expanding the land in the Township of Langley dedicated to food production? An alarming number of acres of existing farmland in TOL are unproductive. Efforts here are important. Can The Township 'lead the way' in getting small farms productive? Any other uses proposed on ALR MUST include some net benefit to agriculture.
 - **Kim Richter:** Our existing ALR lands should be preserved and more of this land should be brought into active food production. In situations where land is just not farmable due to soil conditions, it should only be allowed to be removed if an equal amount of farmable land not currently in the ALR is brought into Langley Township's ALR as a direct trade. I believe the major issue on the horizon is the production of cannabis which I am concerned will displace current food production. This issue requires the provincial government's cooperation and support. While cannabis is profitable and job-producing, it should not displace food production. Langley Township will need to advocate strongly to the provincial government about this.
 - **Kerri Ross:** I feel very strongly about the preservation of farmland, not just in Langley but in relation to any developing area. I would only expand it if there was a provision on proper usage of the included land(s). Often usable / unusable land swaps equal less ALR land in the long-term.
 - **Blair Whitmarsh:** I believe we need to preserve our farmland in the ALR. We should also focus on making better use of the ALR. Currently 40% of the ALR is actually used for food production and that is not enough. We need to find ways to expand the use of the protected ALR land so that more of it is being used for food production.
 - **Harold Whittell:** I support the protection and preservation of our ALR lands. I also think we need to find a way to match unused land with young farmers who are looking to farm. Agri tourism is alive and well and we need to work to promote value added businesses to this realm. The best way to preserve farm land is to have it being used and profitable.
6. Would you support more robust riparian setbacks (riparian means the areas on either side of a stream) and a commitment to not allowing them to be varied?
- **Anna Remenik:** We should be using the science available today to ensure the best possible stewardship of our groundwater and watercourses, and follow through with consistent enforcement of best practices, by providing zoning that reflects that. We need to protect the health of our streams and fisheries.
 - **Petrina Arnason:** I would support working with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Ministry of the Environment in order to review the current setback criteria and

protocols, which should be reviewed from time to time due to changing climate and geophysical changes within the local area. The issue of allowing variances is somewhat complicated by the reliance that we have currently given to “qualified professionals” who work with planning staff in order to balance the interests, and maximize yields, on properties that contain a watercourse. It is my view that any SPEA’s granted through the permitting process must be demonstrably beneficial, and that they should further include specific and focussed habitat enhancement, in order to protect species at risk and other identified habitat.

- **Gail Chaddock-Costello:** Yes, I would support more robust riparian setbacks and I am very opposed to granting variances on these setbacks.
- **David Davis:** I would absolutely support more robust riparian setbacks. They are good for the environment, good for creeks and good for agricultural.
- **Steve Ferguson:** The Derek Doubleday arboretum could be used as a demonstration site and protected area...including the Education centre. Providing vital knowledge to Residents Tree Bylaw I supported the Interim Tree By-law for Brookwood, and I believe that has worked well I also support a tree by-law that will work Township wide through the Public Consultation process: ALR ...can it be applied there? (we have approx. 75% of the Township in the ALR) Private property rights...permission from the residents public property ... needs to be assessed and documented
- **Bob Long:** Would you support more robust riparian setbacks (riparian means the areas on either side of a stream) and a commitment to not allowing them to be varied? I am not sure of what the exact numbers should be, but consultation with stakeholders should be ongoing. Again, a benefit to the waterway is the goal.
- **Kim Richter:** Yes. I believe the previous provincial government was wrong to reduce riparian setbacks. Changing setbacks will require provincial government support as Township rules do not trump the province. The province trumps us.
- **Kerri Ross:** I would support it, and include a provision to remove the chance of a variance. There may also be an opportunity to put solid language into the riparian set back clauses that say that if there is a superior development, building, or plan that exceeds standards and offers superior protection it can be allowed. This would open up the community to opportunities to work with Institutions, Universities etc to look to Langley for opportunities to further research and experimentation into "outside the box" methodology from the outset without putting exemptions to future council.
- **Blair Whitmarsh:** I support the current riparian setbacks that are mandated by Provincial regulations. I believe we should be diligent in committing to those setbacks.
- **Harold Whittell:** I am not sure we need to increase the current setbacks in all cases, but I do believe certain properties and areas could and should be looked at in that light. I do not support variances for these setbacks. I also believe in areas like Gloucester where they have reduced setbacks grandfathered in from the 80’s need to be stopped and brought to today’s standards.

Answers are complete for all the candidates that submitted responses.