

## WORKSHOP ON VISION, GOALS & ACTIONS FOR THE SEA-TO-SKY CORRIDOR AQMP

~ A meeting of the Howe Sound Community Forum and the  
Proposed Sea to Sky Air Quality Coordinating Committee~

**Sea-to-Sky Hotel, Eagle Room**  
**16 June 2005, 9:30am – 4:00 pm**

### MEETING NOTES

---

#### Participants:

Douglas Miller	Mayor, Lions Bay
Ian Sutherland	Mayor, District of Squamish
Hugh O'Reilly	Mayor, RMOW
Lisa Barrett	Mayor, Bowen Island
Al Strang	Manager, Environmental & External Relations, Howe Sound Pulp & Paper
Andrea Goldsmith	Councillor, Town of Gibsons
Bill Beamish	Councillor, Town of Gibsons
Brent Moore	Environmental Quality Section Head, Lower Mainland Region, MWLAP
David Bodner	Community, Aboriginal and Government Relations, Terasen Gas
Emma Dalsanto	Transportation Demand Management Planner, RMOW
Francesca Langford	Environmental Coordinator, District of Squamish
Jeanne Taylor	Environmental Supervisor, Western Pulp
Lisa Griffith	Planner, SLRD
Lourette Swanepoel	Facilitator, The Sheltair Group
Marc Zurbuchen	One Tonne Challenge Coordinator, RMOW
Scott Pass	Transit Manager, BC Transit
Stephanie Meyn	Regional Meteorologist, MWLAP

Notetaker: Samantha Petticrew, Consultant, The Sheltair Group

---

#### WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

1. Develop shared vision for air quality in the corridor.
2. Identify key air quality issues.
3. Define goals that will contribute to achieving the vision.
4. Identify strategies for early action.
5. Discuss long-term funding sources and structure.

#### WORKSHOP OUTLINE

1. Trends in air quality
2. Developing a shared vision
3. AQMP structure and funding
4. Identifying key issues
5. Identifying key goals
6. Ideas for early action
7. Next steps...

## **PRESENTATION OVERVIEW**

Lourette Swanepoel (Sheltair) facilitated the workshop, filling in for Cora Hallsworth. Stephanie Meyn (MWLAP) presented and was the technical resource. The workshop format consisted of short presentations interspersed with group exercises and discussions. Lourette started off the presentation with a quick overview of the Adaptive Management Framework.

## **Trends in Air Quality**

Stephanie provided the context for the day by reviewing the current state of air quality (including common air contaminants, greenhouse gases and air toxics), forecast projections and projected growth in the Sea-to-Sky corridor. In general, over the past ten years there is no discernable trend in particulate matter and ozone for Squamish and Whistler, though data indicates that both communities are very close to BC Objectives and Canada-wide standards.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emission inventories and forecasts have been completed for the GVRD and Whistler but have not yet been developed for the Sea-to-Sky Corridor. GVRD and Whistler inventories indicate that a significant portion of GHG emissions are from light duty vehicles and space heating. While overall emissions per capita are expected to decrease, predicted population growth will increase the total amount of emissions in the corridor, outpacing any growth in industrial sources.

Air toxics are not currently quantified for this corridor. However, the GVRD has a draft air toxics inventory and the type of toxics in the Sea-to-Sky corridor would be similar (quantities would be very different).

## **Developing a Shared Vision**

After the review of trends in air quality, Lourette reviewed the Howe Sound Community Forum's Principles of Cooperation and then introduced the exercises on visioning. There were two questions: "Why is healthy air important in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor?" and "How do you envision Sea-to-Sky air quality in the next 20 years?" Everyone was given a chance to think and write down their thoughts on separate pieces of paper that were collected at the end. Then each question was discussed at the table. Facilitators took notes on the flip charts.

General themes on the first question revolved around health, economy and the environment. The second question's theme focused on air that was cleaner than it is currently in spite of the growth in the corridor. The following bulleted lists are a compilation of participants' thoughts.

### **Why is healthy air important in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor?**

- Decreases health care costs; agreed to social contract; 3 pillars of sustainability (economic, environmental stewardship; social value).
- It is important to individual health, community health, economic health (i.e. tourism) and ecological functioning. This area is known far and wide for its natural beauty and recreational amenities and clean, healthy fresh air is one of our biggest, overarching attributes.
- AQ determines the overall health of ecosystems, including human populations.
- AQ is directly related to health impacts and visual impacts so it is important to manage air quality to balance appropriately competing interests.
- Health – personal, natural systems. Tourism – economy, views & vistas.
- Residents/aging population. Economy – outdoor activities. Forests – visuals/burns.
- AQ has a direct effect on the health of residents and visitors to the S2S corridor. Clean air provides an ability to enjoy the natural surrounding environment which everyone enjoys in this part of the world.
- Important to public health, quality of life, and economy to keep it as an attractive outdoor recreation destination.
- Making sure we keep our air clean helps keep us healthy, our environment healthy and our economy healthy. To not do so will have dire consequences for our personal (individual) health and well being, the quality of life and in the longer term will keep our health care costs down.

- Human health/animal health. We have a stewardship obligation to the natural environment of which our air shed is a part. Makes [long-term] economic sense.
- Healthy air contributes to healthy people – today and well into the future. Contributes to healthy lifestyle and a good quality of life.
- Health of the community (residents and visitors) and the environment (ecosystems); lifestyle protection, quality of life.
- Important for healthy life style for those living in the corridor; for a “healthy” view of the corridor for those deciding to live in and / or visit the corridor.
- More than ever the S2S is becoming dependant on recreation as the primary or one of the primary employers and economic drivers and continual and future success will be difficult if we don't have clean air and water. Further, the health of the permanent population is compromised by these same factors.

## How do you envision Sea-to-Sky air quality in the next 20 years?

- As clean or cleaner than it is today due to: integrated, managed approach in place that rewards population with a healthy, un-polluted airshed; clean energy sources (no fossil fuels); efficient and effective public transit system and smart land use planning.
- Showing continuous levels of improvement relative to all air quality indicators; community member are exemplary of a collective commitment to reduce air emissions; community leaders have influenced regional air quality standards.
- Measured air quality meets the guidelines and regulations to protect health, environment and the economy (i.e. to ensure sustainability).
- Clean air, free of contaminants. Ozone areas decreasing.
- It's amazing that with the amount of growth the S2S has seen and yet the air quality has been maintained by use of good planning principles, smart growth, new fuel technology, buy into transit and other non-fossil fuel alternatives for heat sources.
- At the very least, the air quality has remained the same as it currently is...has not deteriorated further. Preferably, the air quality has improved as compared to the present.
- Hopes: ban on burning of land clearing debris; transit that gets us out of cars; “cleaner” heating alternatives; fewer childhood asthma cases; re-evaluation of industrial permit discharges as science improves. Fears: lack of link between current [future] development and transport practices/policies and implications on AQ; unlimited time to solve problems.
- Sustained, well planned, and smart growth within and between communities resulting in no net increase in air emissions. An area known for a healthy lifestyle including air quality.
- Clear, crisp mountain air, fresh ocean smell – salt air, awesome views of ocean/mountains and rivers, abundant wildlife and diversity of species, multi-season outdoor sports activities, and healthy residents – “fit”.
- No added health impacts due to development/more people; no increase in CACs, GHGs or air toxics; no visual impacts to visitor experience; continued positive perception of environmental quality – a selling feature; and model for other communities.
- Air that is able to support the growing population and provide a supply of healthy air for all local inhabitants; perception of image of region: odour replaced with aroma or scent (more positive).
- Crystal clear views/vistas of mountains, glaciers, islands of Howe Sound; attracts people from more polluted parts of the world to live in a health airshed; people aren't experiencing persistent coughs, drop in asthma, drop in nagging allergies; and air smells like - mountains, sea.
- Improved through less reliance on fossil fuels for transportations and home heating and better mass transit. Worsened by resident and visitor population increase.
- The air is crisp, smells like the forest and the sea, visibility is unlimited, industrial plants have closed loop systems, public/ mass transportation is everywhere – including ferries – Hwy 99 has been converted to rail, fleets have been converted to vegetable based fuels and hybrid systems (including marine/boats; and home heating alternatives include solar panels on all roofs.

## AQMP Funding and Structure

Stephanie presented the group with options for the AQMP structure and funding. The group was asked to discuss and make decisions on the following:

- Annual/Fixed Budget v. Project Budget
- Funding structure (models from other AQ management groups)
- Current funding in 2005/06 (\$15K needed)
- Account Management and Administration

The group was then given a chance to discuss these issues. Overall, they preferred a project budget in the short term (up to March 2006) but over the long term it was felt that a five year plan would help councils to see the upfront costs that later taper off to lower maintenance costs. The group was generally supportive of using population for determining funding contribution (i.e. percent financial contribution to AQMP planning process is based on municipality's percent population with respect to airshed population). It was noted that Whistler's day population, approximately the same as Squamish, should be used in this calculation. To complete the strategies and actions for the AQMP by March 2006, a further \$15,000 is required above the \$25,000 already provided by MWLAP. Some municipalities have volunteered to contribute some money to see this completed, although a firm commitment is still required. There was also discussion regarding funding of the [seatoskyairquality.ca](http://seatoskyairquality.ca) website, and it was generally agreed that this would act as the central information source. Stephanie agreed to investigate potential short term and long term costs to update and maintain the website. There was some discussion on using the federal gas tax rebates as a funding source although not all communities will have access to these funds (e.g. Lions Bay is a part of the GVRD and therefore will not receive a share). Squamish was volunteered to be the account manager and administer the contracts. Whistler volunteered that they would do it if Squamish were unable to do so.

Over the longer term, a five year financial plan was preferred with the early years front-loaded to get things going. Costs would decrease once the plan is into the maintenance stage (the later part of the five years).

Notes from the discussion of these issues can be found on page 7.

## Identifying Key Issues

The afternoon started off with identifying key air quality issues and drivers. A list of issues and drivers was presented, and included:

- visibility
- human health
- ecosystem health
- odour
- tourism losses
- regional contribution to climate change
- liveability

Participants were asked to review the list and add issues and impacts that they thought were missing or cut those that were not appropriate. Each group's revised list was written on their flip chart, which was then shared with the larger group (see the flip chart notes for each group on page 12). The plenary group discussed these lists and a master list was synthesized. Each participant was given four sticky dots to vote for what they felt was the top issues. The master list with the number of votes in [ x ] follows:

- visibility
- perception (outsiders) [8]
- ecosystem health [9]
- changes in health sensitivity
- tourism losses
- quality of life and liveability [8]
- economic health [14]
- viewscapes/vistas [7]
- localized impacts
- food quality/production/agriculture
- human health (short and long term) [16]
- identity (insiders)
- odour
- contribution to climate change
- property value
- health care costs (short and long term)
- noise related impacts
- climate change (recession of glaciers, flooding, heat waves, forest fires) [2]
- leadership

During the discussion of issues and impacts, the group identified some challenges, causes and problems. These were captured on another flip chart. They are:

- marketing (community based) – changing people’s behaviour
- public education
- importing food
- lack of alternatives – jobs, policy, housing (affordable), transportation
- growth
- consumption patterns – feeling of entitlement to bigger and better things, expectation of affluence
- externalizing costs – globalization
- waste exports
- traditional economics – not counting appropriately

## Identifying Key Goals

In this section of the presentation, existing goals in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor and in other jurisdictions were introduced and used as examples. Following this, Lourette introduced the exercise. At each table, participants (including the facilitators) paired up and were given one of the top impacts/issues that were determined in the previous exercise. Each pairing crafted a goal statement that addressed the impact/issue. The table facilitator then recorded the goals on the flipchart and the small group was given the opportunity to further refine each goal. These were then shared with the larger group.

The following list was taken from each group’s flip chart:

- Climate change – manage air contribution to climate change and its effects by: Meeting or exceeding the local equivalent of federal GHG and provincial CAC targets by – encouraging development that reduce contribution (through tax incentives), educating residents and visitors on impacts, alternatives, actions.
- Leadership – Showcase goals and successes and leadership at a micro and macro level (local and world) – using platform of 2010 to showcase S2S as a model.
- Odour – eliminate the emission of odour causing substances, which negatively impact on human, economic and ecosystem health.
- Economic health – A strong diverse sustainable local economy that creates local jobs paying liveable wages in integrated communities and has a positive overall impact on AQ. Indicators – distance traveled to work and average wage.
- Visibility – To reduce sources of air contaminants that impact air quality/visibility in order to maintain protect and improve aesthetic viewsapes and vistas. Indicator – number of bad visibility days.
- Human health – reduce the rate and frequency of respiratory related diagnoses and health care visits through improved regional air quality. Indicators – asthma, hospital clinic visits (acute), new incidents, mortality related, chronic vs acute, and emphysema.
- Ecosystem health – maximize preservation of emission, limitations and green space in community planning/land development vegetation as “natural air filet” that helps maintain “healthy air”.
- Perception – Canada & the world – when they think of S2S they think – clean air, healthy lifestyle mountains beauty wilderness – we must maintain this view as REALITY. World view – must be our REALITY.
- Quality of life/ liveability – maintain a high quality of live and liveability by improving AQ for the benefit of all users of the Howe Sound airshed.

## Ideas for early action

Stephanie presented examples of early actions that could be undertaken in the Sea-to-Sky Corridor. These included planning mechanisms, regulatory mechanisms such as bylaws, economic incentives, public education and partnership initiatives and programs. The Sea-to-Sky Corridor is already engaged in some planning mechanisms such as developing and revising Official Community Plans, greenhouse gas action plans, community energy plans, SmartGrowth initiatives and integrated planning. Stephanie then provided examples of regulatory mechanisms. One example of a regulatory mechanism, a burning bylaw, has been implemented in a number of jurisdictions including Squamish, Gibsons, Prince George, North Okanagan, Quesnel and Golden. Work from the Okanagan is particularly applicable to the Sea-to-Sky region. Further examples of economic incentives, public education and partnership initiatives and programs were provided. There are examples of early actions everywhere and this group could take advantage of linkages and partnerships with the GVRD and other municipalities. The "Tools" Guide from MWLAP is a useful reference.

Following the presentation, there was a facilitated plenary discussion on early actions. Early actions were identified based on issue areas and focused on ideas that were within the groups' sphere of influence. Note that there has been no commitment made to carry out these actions. The results were listed on a flip chart and are summarised below (for the full list please see page 13).

- Anti-idling bylaw (same across the entire airshed).
- Regional public education.
- Integration of public transit linking Bowen Island and Lions Bay with the Translink system in Horseshoe Bay. And links with Pemberton, Whistler and Squamish (BC Transit) with Translink (initiative underway).
- Work with Terasen to leverage funding.
- Use the website as an information clearinghouse, provide links to other sources of information such as West Coast Environmental Law ([www.wcel.org](http://www.wcel.org))

## Next Steps...

Following this workshop, the next steps are to:

- Compile the results of this workshop.
- Circulate vision, goals and funding approach for committee approval.
- Circulate funding proposals and seek commitment from Councils and Boards.
- Committee members seek approval from their Councils and Boards.
- Seek consensus on changing the name from Sea-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan to Howe Sound - Sea-to-Sky Air Quality Management Plan.
- Develop indicators.
- Schedule workshop for the early Fall on the topics of targets and actions.

## WRAP UP

Note: Early fall meeting much better due to municipal elections in November.

Stephanie announced that as of August she is transferring to the head office in Victoria. Her job will be similar to the one she does now (although provincial rather than regional in scope) and she will still be involved in this process although not directly.

Please report any errors or omissions within these meeting notes to Cora Hallsworth by email at [challsworth@sheltair.com](mailto:challsworth@sheltair.com), or by phone at 604-732-9106, ext. 305.

## QUESTIONS DURING PRESENTATIONS

Q: On planning, how does the provincial government make decisions and how does air quality factor in? E.g., the Sea-to-Sky air quality impacts.

A: Air quality monitoring during construction, open burning alternatives for slash from land clearing. Ministry of Transportation committed to participating in this process.

Comment: Existing initiatives really exciting. Would hate to leave the action until next year. Could work on actions and get other things going simultaneously.

Comment: Change the name to include Howe Sound as currently the name does not sound like it includes areas of Howe Sound – there is representation from the islands and the GVRD. New name suggested: Howe Sound - Sea-to-Sky Airshed.

## DISCUSSION ON FUNDING MODELS AND STRUCTURE

Stephanie presented a few slides on funding issues including the differences between having an annual fixed budget versus a project budget, some example of funding structures and the proposed structure for this AQMP.

Question: Gibsons not included on the pie chart (in the presentation). Why?

Answer: Stephanie said this was an oversight. Under the proposed funding structure, Gibsons would pay about \$2,500 (to be confirmed).

Comment: We appreciate your efforts to get us thinking about this.

Comment: GVRD included with Bowen Island (in terms of the pie chart of funding).

Comments: There is a bigger question. There is some urgency. With the Regional Growth Strategy proposals underway, land-use planning is key to air quality. What can we get out of this process?

- SLRD – there is some information included in the RGS base case but no air quality forecasting.
- Fast track this AQMP process to utilize results in the RGS.
- The hope is that if this process is fast tracked, strategies and actions can inform the RGS (to be completed in the next 1 – 2 years) and other growth management plans.
- This is critical for RGS decisions. Decision makers not well informed, staff do not have the tools to make the decisions.
- The challenges are that planning is happening now and we need to use the information on air quality to inform the plans.
- Bowen Island is stalled in the Community energy planning process - in a pressure cooker. Could sell the AQMP process by showing how crucial this is for future planning decisions.
- Stephanie: Funding the next two years may be very different in terms of getting things done, compared to the long-term funding structure.

Comment: Government should lead funding for planning and industry should help fund actions or implementation.

Comment: Save time and money for communities down the road.

Comment: We want to see tangible stuff happening.

Comment: Hope to make better decisions upstream to prevent problems (best practices, planning) and in 50 years the Whistler business model is to be off fossil fuels. Take responsibility to change. Share best practices.

Comment: Planning v. policy. Development issues but there are also other things. Gibsons in 2006 has banned all backyard burning. SLRD moving towards this. Provide alternatives to burning. Can do many things that show leadership by doing stuff at home that influences neighbours.

## **DISCUSSION ON REMAINING FUNDING (for F06)**

Comment: Observation: Population % is a reasonable approach in the short term. Is the proportional method right? (Whistler mentioned that it should be based on their day population, which is approximately the same as Squamish.)

Comment: Perhaps go to the Olympic committee to request funding. Others felt that it was not their mandate to fund planning and they move too slow.

Comment: if there was a synopsis of tools already implemented, could use it to get funding.

Comment: if there was a 5 year plan, could see the upfront costs and then the maintenance stages. Get indicators in the front end and can show results through empirical data.

Comment: SLRD – small percent of budget already allocated to air quality, so could increase the share of the SLRD pie.

Comment: important to get it happening, but would like to see industry putting in money but also government should show leadership.

Comment: Annual fixed budget in short term but 5 year plan good too.

Comment: Project budget in short term but forecast longer term budget.

Comment: More interested in outputs, critical for next years. In the short term, really need to get going – critical.

Comment: Request to each community – urgency due to RGS. Results of meeting – what's next?

Comment: Land-use planning is done first – this influences later.

Comment: Send out package that explains this, what we hope to accomplish, what we want to do, what other agencies could be involved, and how to access federal funding (climate change money).

Comment: Information presented in first meeting – emissions not just from point sources.

Comment: Concern with using the tax base to determine \$ contributions. E.g. Lions Bay part of GVRD. Translink used tax base which created significant friction between areas due to differences in assessed property values. Using population is simple and defensible.

Comment: How to capture and include tourism vehicle impacts? Whistler would use day population (equivalent to Squamish) and contribute the same.

Comment: Gas tax rebates as a source of funding. This is a good link to air quality. Although as part of the GVRD, Lions Bay will not get any of this money as it all goes to Translink.

Comment: Squamish has offered to be administrator of the fund. Whistler could also do it and thinks that this is very important. However, there is a lot of activity in Squamish so this would be a good example for them.

Comment: Show in funding proposal how this initiative will help support and enhance other initiatives.

Next Steps: Take ideas and put in a funding proposal to circulate to Councils. Whistler has offered to help promote this throughout the corridor. Probably no need to make visits to councils as everyone is on board. Members of the group will 'sell' to their councils on behalf of the Air Quality Coordinating Committee.

## DISCUSSION ON EARLY ACTIONS

Comment: Prince George and City of North Vancouver have implemented a broad “No Idling” policy. Could something like that be looked at? Gibsons only has five fleet vehicles so not much of an impact from town operations but region wide could be better.

Comment: Sharing bylaws between municipalities. Enforcement of bylaws first by complaints and offender notified by letter, then later ticketing.

Comment: West Coast Environmental law webpage (<http://www.wcel.org/>) has information and links. Bowen Island has an education campaign with school kids on anti-idling.

Comment: Education is a large component – people need to know why – then they’ll comply without enforcement.

Comment: Marc from Whistler has a federal government binder on anti-idling campaigns.

Q: What about an AirCare program in the corridor?

A (Stephanie): Federal government had voluntary program (now cancelled).

Comment: Suggestion to have AirCare failures linked to vehicle registration. This would inform purchasers who may reside outside of AirCare areas.

Question on Scrap It! Program. Answer: Dollars are given for scrapping your car.

Comment: Education is preferable first, then regulations.

Comment: May be useful to have same bylaws across the region. E.g., an idling time limit that is consistent.

Comment: Staged approach to implementation of bylaws. First year free, second year enforced. Other regions are encouraged to participate.

Comment: Transportation and space heating are the biggest problems – start here first. Take advantage of programs already in action. Ability to set trends, which programs have best returns, which will show the best results – use as a criteria for program selection.

Comment: Local community shuttles. Lion’s Bay and Bowen Island trying to integrate bus system with Translink. Possibly link to Whistler/Squamish?

Comment: Current initiative to link Pemberton, Whistler & Squamish (part of BC Transit) to Translink.

Comment: Get money from province to get buy-in and commitment.

Comment: Possibly will need someone to spearhead programs and go after other funding – full time coordinator?

Comment: Website for questions, forum, sharing material (bylaws etc). Potential to have a listserv (need a moderator). Looked at as a “one stop shop” for information for both staff and public. Need to keep it up to date and active. Stephanie will cost out how much to get site up and running and maintained.

Comment: Sharing information very important

Comment: Website costs (outsourcing) – Squamish has IT person (consultant) could potentially add website on to job descriptions.

Comment: Full time coordinator and website. Website more important than full time person. Need to make sure that someone is driving the process (e.g. Sheltair). Possibly part-time person as coordinator with others sharing the duties. Look at up coming federal budget for funding.

Comment: Pros/cons to having an internal/external person.

Comment: important to get the 5 year financial plan done soon to give municipalities an opportunity to approve in new budgets.

Comment: Possible partnerships? E.g. Bowen Island with Islands Trust.

Comment: Energy is also an issue. Terasen has access to funding and associate plans and programs. Terasen works with municipalities to leverage funds from other agencies.

## FLIP CHART NOTES

### Developing a Shared Vision for Air Quality

#### 1) WHY IS AIR QUALITY IMPORTANT IN S2S CORRIDOR?

- AQ is directly related to health & visual impacts – important to manage to balance competing interests.
- Important to individual health economic (ie tourism) health and ecological functioning.
- Human health and related health care costs.
- AQ determines overall health of ecosystems including human populations.
- AQ is a reflection of regions social values.
- Individual health economic costs, quality of life, environment (natural systems).
- Linked to identity/image of the region (outdoor rec/natural).
- Perception & image – visibility, odour/aroma, personal health.
- Demographics/health.
- Impacts on forests/natural systems.
- Links to other pathways (water {sfc} ) – drinking water.
- Tourism impacts on perception.
- Visibility and scenic views and vistas.
- Odours/aroma.
- Healthy air = healthy people/lifestyle.
- Think “What makes a successful business”?
- Healthy environment/ecosystems.
- Visitor/resident – perception of healthy corridor.
- Depend on tourism – economics.
- Quality of life.
- Stewardship obligation.
- Future of corridor depends on it.
- \*Maintaining “reputation” of clean, healthy, “natural” maintaining why people come to the corridor.

#### 2) HOW DO YOU ENVISION AQ IN THE S2S CORRIDOR IN 20 YEARS?

- Clean air, free of contaminants, ozone areas decreasing.
- Shown continuous levels of improvement relative to all indicators of AQ.
- Air is clean or cleaner than today due to an integrated managed approach to AQ, clean energy sources (ie no fossil fuels), and efficient & effective public transit system and smart land use planning.
- AQ in the region meets guidelines established by government to protect health, environment and economy. (ie. To ensure sustainability).
- Community members are exemplary of collective commitment to reduce air emissions.
- Community leaders have influenced a greater regional AQ standard.
- Air that supports growing population, healthy air for all local inhabitants.
- Crystal clear views and blue skies.
- Attract people to cleaner air (perceived as a “place to come and be & get healthy”)
- Factors achieving a balance between growth and AQ (transp and sp heating/fossil fuel use?)
- Equal or better air than present
- A model of health (enviro + economy).
- Air is crisp (smells like forest & sea) unlimited visibility closed loop (efficiency) systems for industry, mass transit everywhere incl ferries.
- Hwy 99 is converted to rail.
- Fleets converted to veg based fuels.
- Solar panels on all rooftops and wind/micro-hydro for home heating/water etc. (circulating water (underground) heating/cooling seasonal storage and geothermal.
- Alternative & green common.
- High air quality by good planning between and within communities. Smart growth, technology, transit, non fossil heat sources.
- Despite growth quality remains same (or improves)
- Clear crisp maintained air.

- Wild life and diversity of species.
- Fresh ocean air (salt air)
- Views of river valley and mountains
- Multi season sport and outdoor.
- No net increase in pollution.
- Known for healthy lifestyle and air.
- Ban of green land burning.
- Fewer child asthma cases.
- Continuous improvement of industrial discharges.
- Fear – lack of urgency – short-term time frame – lack of link current and future planning practices.
- Land use supports air.
- Political and engineering awareness and action.
- Updating planning/engineering approaches/design standards.

## Identifying Key Air Quality Issues and Impacts

### Group 1

#### IMPACTS

- Visibility
- Human health
- Ecosystem health (difficult to measure → how to show progress)
- Odour, taste
- Business losses (e.g. tourism)
- Climate changes (recession of glaciers, extreme weather, flooding, heat waves & fires)
- Liveability (umbrella term for all of the above) → community well being
- Agriculture (distribution chain)

#### IMPEDIMENTS/CHALLENGES

- Lack of alternatives (transportation, local jobs, affordable housing)

#### DRIVERS/CAUSES

- Growth

### Group 2

#### KEY ISSUES

- Tourism loss → attracting businesses; → economic loss
- Asthma/respiratory problems: sensitive populations (seniors, kids, etc) *arrow to liveability*
- Mitigation costs: retrofits
- Liveability/quality of life, short & long term health impacts → \$\$
- Ecosystem health: as “natural air cleaner”
- Marketing social change → convincing people to change behaviours: connectivity between air quality issues and “daily” behaviours.

### Group 3

#### KEY ISSUES

- visibility
- perception
- ecosystem health
- changes in health sensitivity
- tourism losses
- quality of life and liveability
- economic health
- viewsapes/vistas
- localized impacts
- food quality/production/agriculture

- human health (short and long term)
- identity
- odour
- contribution to climate change
- property value
- health care costs (short and long term)
- noise related impacts

## Potential Early Actions

- Prince George – No Idling Program (regional perspective) → municipality to lead
- North Vancouver has bylaw for all vehicles, not just fleet. Whistler has a bylaw too but only for large vehicles.
- West Coast Environmental has example of best practices.
- Suggestion of an anti-idling policy for BC Ferries
- Education and enforcement critical to explain why → volunteers handed out brochures on the anti-idling bylaw (Bowen Island did this)
- Clearinghouse of existing bylaws
- Education regionally → Federal binder on anti-idling available (from Whistler)
- AirCare program → too expensive for this region
- Green Fleet (Federal program) was here but then cancelled
- Car scrapping programs
- Comment: regions outside of the AirCare program get stuck with cars that failed → suggest that program inform buyer that they are getting a “failed” car.
- Staggered approach to phasing in a bylaw: Year 1 Educate; Year 2 Enforce
- Transportation and space heating biggest problem → focus on maybe later
- Municipality → leadership and set trends; test action and effectiveness
- Current Lions Bay and Bowen Island initiative – integrate Translink bus system with Bowen and Lions Bay. Potential links with Squamish, Whistler and. Pemberton
- MOU with province to support and buy-in our actions
- We need a dedicated full time person to look after programs and fundraise and educate → may be too costly.
- Website for sharing info essential → public
- Listserv and moderator
- Awareness and sharing crucial → see what others do and we don't/should.
- Squamish web site administrator if possible.
- One Tonne Challenge → spread education outside of Whistler → future fund in next budget.
- Benefit to having an outside coordinator → no bias
- 5 year financial plan to incorporate in budget → fast track front load
- Islands Trust as a potential partner
- Energy:
  - Leverage federal funding through Terasen
  - Building incentives
  - Ground source heat pumps etc not just gas (Terasen focus and work)
- Terasen work with municipalities to help leverage funds.