



City of Surrey

Environmental Advisory Committee

Minutes

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2009
Time: 6:30 p.m.
File: 0540-20

Present:

Councillor Bose
B. Campbell
M. Deo
C. Dragomir
M. Harcourt
K. Keshvani
D. Maher
G. Sahota
G. Sangha
A. Schulze
B. Stewart

Also Present:

V. Sahni, BC Centre for Disease Control
T. Kosatsky, BC Centre for Disease Control
K. Mullinix, Kwantlen Polytechnic
University

Staff Present:

C. Baron, Drainage & Environment Manager
O. Croy, Manager, Parks
G. Vandenbosch, Manager, Park Operations -
North
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

Regrets:

S. VanKeulen - Agricultural Advisory
Committee Representative

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

Councillor Bose acted as Chair for the meeting.

The Agenda was varied.

B. DELEGATIONS

Further to the request from Council that the EAC provide further investigation and to report back to Council on the use of pesticides, and as requested at the November 19, 2008 EAC meeting, the following delegations were in attendance to provide a presentation to the Committee:

1. Vanita Sahni, Environmental Health Scientist, Environmental Health Services, BC Centre for Disease Control

Ms. Sahni provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding the results of a recent review on whether by-laws restricting the use of cosmetic pesticides are effective in reducing community level of exposure to pesticides. Comments were as follows:

- The presentation talks specifically about pesticides for cosmetic purposes (residential).
- As at May 1, 2008, there are 146 municipalities across Canada that have adopted pesticide by-laws.
- There are several reasons for support in implementing by-laws:
 - Health (perception);
 - Environment;
 - Public pressure; and
 - Existing by-laws in other municipalities.

- Opposition to the implementation of a by-law include:
 - A desire for the 'perfect lawn';
 - Loss of income (pesticide manufacturers/commercial operators); and
 - Financial cost (municipalities).
- There can be exposure to pesticides through diet, indoor pest-control products, agricultural drift and outdoor residential use.
- Factors that affect exposure include:
 - Application (e.g., amount used, application method, personal protective equipment);
 - Ambient conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity, wind);
 - Post-application interventions (e.g., removing shoes, storing clothing outside); and
 - Population exposed (e.g., applicator [professional/residential], resident, neighbour, community member).
- Given that the most common rationale in support of the by-law is health, the question was put whether or not a by-law was an effective intervention at reducing exposure.
- The regulation of pesticides does indirectly impact exposure. [A review of the framework of potential interventions and levels of governmental authority to reduce cosmetic pesticide exposure was provided.]
- There is a wide range of restriction pesticide by-laws in Canada. For example, Winnipeg, Manitoba has no restriction on pesticide use, Caledon, Ontario restricts when and how pesticides may be used (based on temperature, wind and month to reduce pesticide drift) and Toronto, Ontario bans the use of specified pesticides.

Discussion ensued regarding enforcement options for a by-law, noting that enforcement could be difficult. The discussion was followed by a review of the three different types of evaluations (process, outcome and impact) that were done, the results of those evaluations and how they can be improved upon at both the community and individual level. Alternatives to by-laws were also reviewed (i.e. provincial restriction of sale). Comments continued:

- Some communities have chosen to implement an education program instead of a by-law.
- A best practices review indicated that:
 - by-laws supported by education achieve greater pesticide use reduction (51-90%) compared to education/outreach alone (10-24%); and
 - based on limited data, education programs cost less than the implementation and enforcement of a by-law.
- Conclusions from the study indicate:
 - exposure reduction is desirable;
 - there is some evidence that municipal bans have reduced cosmetic pesticide use(although generalizing between municipalities is problematic);
 - reduced use may not equal decreased exposure (no evidence of decreased exposure to bystanders following municipal bans);

- provincial ban has a greater potential to reduce exposure:
 - given provincial use restrictions equivalent to municipal by-laws; and
 - would lead to consistency between sales, restrictions and proscribed use;
- municipal role remains important (reducing municipal use, pesticide disposal, education, advocacy); and
- a need for evaluation of by-laws (this gap fuels the by-law debate).

In response to the Committee's questions, the following was noted:

- There have been several resolutions urging the province to ban cosmetic pesticides that have been tabled three times.
- The information tabled at the UBCM is a mix; UBCM have asked for a province wide ban at the provincial level.
- There have been some questions raised regarding proper scientific, proven evidence that have been dealt with in different ways, however none have equated to pesticide by-laws.

The Committee thanked V. Sahni and T. Kosatsky for the presentation.

2. Kent Mullinix, Institute for Sustainable Horticulture Kwantlen Polytechnic University

K. Mullinix, Ph.D., currently a Sustainable Agriculture/Integrated Pest Management Specialist with the Institute for Sustainable Horticulture (ISH) at Kwantlen Polytechnic University, was introduced by O. Croy, Manager, Parks. Mr. Mullinix provided a PowerPoint presentation on the PlantHealthBC Pest Management Accreditation Program. Comments were as follows:

- PlantHealth BC was an accreditation program that is developed by broad stakeholder input and overseen by a 20 plus member steering committee, which includes representatives from the federal, provincial and municipal governments, service care providers and environmental groups. It is developed, designed and being implemented under the notion that the municipalities are key partners.
- This steering committee operates as a board of directors to make sure it is true to its word and effective. The more the program gets going the more active the steering committee will be.
- The program objectives are to:
 - encourage responsible landscape pest management in BC by holding industry accountable to high standards of practice;
 - enable public to easily identify companies using responsible and advanced pest management practices;
 - create a program that is open, transparent, self-sustaining and built on strong stakeholder partnerships; and
 - be formative, not punitive or regulatory.
- The focus is on landscape maintenance, lawn care, parks and recreation fields, arboriculture and golf courses.

- This accreditation works for all kinds of service providers, whether or not they are organic or if they use pesticides or not, because the concern of environmentally safe pest management can be and should be used by all service providers. It is a methodology for pest management. Accreditation is for those who are prepared to engage in ecologically sound pest management.
- The program really revolves around standards of practice and a code of ethics. To be accredited, a service provider must commit to use integrated pest management (“IPM”), an information/knowledge based, ecologically focused, decision-making process that uses all necessary techniques, in an integrated fashion, to effectively suppress pests to acceptable levels, economically, in an environmentally sound manner.

A review of the standards and code of ethics was given, noting the commitment to continual improvement, to adhere to the provincial IPM Act and on-going education, as audited and reviewed on an annual basis.

An overview of the municipal partnership responsibilities was provided noting those municipalities that have already committed to the program (Surrey has now become a partner organization). It is anticipated that, by the end of the development and pilot implementation of this project, that there will be at least 200 municipalities (the vast majority) partnered with this program.

INTRODUCTIONS

There was a round table of introductions for the two new members appointed for the ensuing year.

ELECTIONS & APPOINTMENTS

The Chair deferred the elections and appointments to the February meeting in order to give the members an opportunity to acquaint themselves.

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Environmental Advisory Committee (“EAC”) Minutes

It was Moved by C. Dragomir
Seconded by M. Deo
That the minutes of the Environmental
Advisory Committee meeting of November 19, 2008 be adopted.
Carried

C. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. Draft By-law

At the November 19, 2008 EAC meeting, Owen Croy, Manager Parks, was in attendance to discuss the process to be followed for reviewing the proposal to ban the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in the City. At that time, the EAC passed the following motion: *“That the Environmental Advisory Committee recommends that Council direct Staff to present the Environmental Advisory Committee with one or more draft bylaws, as a template for consideration for a ban of the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in the City.”*

Further to the above motion, Owen Croy, Manager Parks, was in attendance for a review and discussion of the draft by-law provided. Comments were as follows:

- This bylaw is an attempt, having heard the Committee’s opinion at past meetings, to capture the interests of the Committee within one by-law. It is draft only as a starting point for further discussion.
- It broadly states that no person shall apply a pesticide on public or private land. It then goes on to note that there are a number of exceptions that deal with products or situations that would be exempted in the by-law.

It was noted that the word “may” used in Section 2, should be replaced with the word “shall”, which conveys more strongly the intention of the word used in this context.

Discussion ensued regarding the definitions, in particular, the definition “Agriculture”. It was suggested that the Agricultural Advisory Committee be consulted for a better definition that will address the fact that agriculture is fully excluded from the by-law. The definition “non-essential” was also queried as to why it could not be termed “cosmetic use”.

There was further discussion regarding accreditation requirements, if any, noting that the delegation heard earlier from PlantHealth BC was still a pilot program and that if the Committee was looking at a blanket ban, then there would be no point in having an accreditation program. The request was made for information on existing by-laws, including a by-law with a complete ban, with a footnote to each of the examples as to the direction of the municipalities (e.g. relaxed by-law opposed to a rigorous by-law).

As there continued to be discussion on what the requirements of the by-law would be for further review by the City’s legal department, it was agreed that alternatives should be provided that address: 1) no cosmetic use; 2) zero application; and 3) whether or not some sort of certification was required. A broad perspective from both the AAC and the DAC would also be appreciated in this regard.

A public forum was discussed suggesting that it be in two parts: 1) a panel of experts (with varying views) to speak to the issues and take questions, which could be publicized broadly (already have other municipalities expressing interest

in sharing the cost of bringing in speakers); and 2) options for the public/stakeholders to provide questions and comments, etc. It was noted that the Surrey Board of Trade should certainly be advised.

A further review will be given at the next EAC meeting, including a draft outline for a public forum, in order to establish the requirements for a report to Council in April.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Surrey Ecosystem Management Study Stakeholder Meeting

File No. 6440-20-2008

Further to the memo dated December 22, 2008 from the General Manager, Planning and Development regarding above subject line, the Committee was advised that the meeting has been postponed. An update will be provided at the February EAC meeting.

Once a new date has been determined, the Committee will be requested to appoint two members of the Committee to attend this meeting, provide input and to represent the Committee through this process.

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

1. Mayor Lois Jackson, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board

Due to time constraints, the letter dated November 6, 2008 from Mayor Lois Jackson, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board, regarding the ban of single-use, disposable shopping bags in BC, was deferred to the February EAC meeting.

F. INFORMATION ITEMS

G. CORRESPONDENCE

H. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

1. EAC 2008 Priority Items & Work Plan

The 2008 Priority Items & Work Plan was provided as a guideline, for review and update for 2009. No additions/omissions were given.

2. Boundary Bay Water Quality Initiatives

The Committee was advised of a forum on Boundary Bay water quality initiatives, noting that there will be larger forums in the coming future (trying to develop a showcase, international, first of its kind program, involving both Canada and the U.S.). An update will be provided at the February meeting.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the EAC will be held on February 18, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

J. ADJOURNMENT

It was

Moved by B. Campbell
Seconded by D. Maher
That the Environmental Advisory

Committee meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Environmental Advisory Committee adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

Chairperson, Councillor Bob Bose
Environmental Advisory Committee