



# City of Surrey

## *Environmental Advisory Committee*

### *Minutes*

Executive Boardroom  
City Hall  
14245 - 56 Avenue  
Surrey, B.C.  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2009  
Time: 6:30 p.m.  
File: 0540-20

---

**Present:**

B. Campbell  
M. Deo  
C. Dragomir  
M. Harcourt  
G. Sahota  
A. Schulze  
B. Stewart

**Agricultural Advisory Committee**  
**Representative:**

S. VanKeulen

**Regrets:**

K. Keshvani  
D. Maher  
G. Sangha  
Councillor Bose

**Staff Present:**

Stephen Godwin, Environmental Coordinator  
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

**Also Present:**

Dave Chesney  
Andrew Schulz, White Rock/Surrey  
Pesticide-free Coalition

---

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**1. Environmental Advisory Committee (“EAC”) Minutes**

It was Moved by C. Dragomir  
Seconded by G. Sahota  
That the minutes of the Environmental  
Advisory Committee meeting of February 18, 2009 be adopted.  
Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS**

**C. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

**1. Update on Draft Pesticide Control By-law**

File: 5280-23

- (a) Further to the draft by-laws for consideration of a ban of the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in the City, which were reviewed at the February 18, 2009 EAC meeting, a memo from Owen Croy, Manager Parks, providing an update, was provided and reviewed.

The Chair advised the Committee of his attendance, with Owen Croy, Manager Parks, to the March 5, 2009 Agricultural Advisory Committee (“AAC”) meeting, to provide background information on the work done on the Draft Pesticide Control By-law and to answer any questions the AAC may have had. At that meeting, the AAC requested, as noted in the memo from O. Croy (page 7), that the by-law should reference the provincial government's weed control legislation, as there are exemptions

for the application of a pesticide to control weeds that are designated 'Noxious' under provincial legislation. Comments were as follows:

- The White Rock draft cosmetic pesticide by-law has very few exemptions.
- Discussion with the AAC members concluded a requirement to have noxious weeds added, as noxious weeds can be attacked by pesticides if they are a threat to agriculture.
- Noxious weeds are not cosmetic.
- The updated draft by-law includes:
  - the addition of “Noxious Weed” definition;
  - “Public Lands” definition no longer refers to the School Board; the City has no jurisdiction over the lands of the School Board;
  - Addition of items:
    - 3(b) controlling a Pest on the residential portion of Agricultural Land;
    - 3(c) Forestry operations; and
    - 3(d) controlling or destroying a Noxious Weed.

Discussion ensued regarding noxious weeds, managing outbreaks, etc. Provincial and Federal regulations were noted, with particular discussion pertaining to the *Noxious Weed Act*. It was further noted that farming makes a very significant contribution to life in Surrey, and it is important to inform the public that the Pesticide Control By-law will permit the use of pesticides as a farm practice. Including a reference to 'Noxious Weeds' in the by-law will help to accomplish that. Comments continued:

- It is important to remember that the Pesticide Control By-law will be a living document and that opportunities to update the By-law will be on-going.
- With regard to the definition of “Agricultural Land”, there should be some clarification to ensure that it is only Agricultural Land as defined under the *Assessment Act*. Residential properties on Agricultural Land that is not being farmed, as defined under the *Assessment Act*, will not be exempt.

It was

Moved by B. Stewart

Seconded by M. Deo

That the definition of “Agricultural Land”, in the Draft Pesticide Control By-law, be amended to read “means land that is classified as a farm under the *Assessment Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c.20.”

Carried

- It is noted that the Canadian Cancer Society would like item 3(g) removed due to public exposure on pedestrian and sport surfaces, the argument to which is safety concerns (e.g. slipping, falling).
- It would be nice if the Pesticide Control By-law not only prevents the public from using pesticides, but over time (as a living document), educates the public with alternatives.

- It was requested that there be further clarification from Staff with respect to item 3(g) “ensuring the safety of pedestrian surfaces or sport surfaces”.

Discussion ensued. Concerns were raised with respect to item 3(i) “... landscape maintenance where there is an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program ...”. It was noted that, although an IPM has a goal and process to deal with landscape maintenance as environmentally as possible (to fertilize properly, weed properly, etc.), there is still the opportunity to use pesticides if needed. The City must lead by example. Although it will make it more difficult for the City to do the work and there will be an increased cost, having the IPM goes against the spirit of the by-law. Further, an IPM is not sustainable; 5% of the worlds’ fuel is being used to make fertilizers, none of which are sustainable.

It was Moved by B. Campbell  
 Seconded by M. Deo  
 That item “3(i)” of the Draft Pesticide  
 Control By-law, be deleted.  
Carried

It was further Moved by M. Deo  
 Seconded by M. Harcourt  
 That item “(b)” under the definition of  
 Sensitive Ecosystem, of the Draft Pesticide Control By-law, be removed  
 altogether.  
Carried

Regarding item 3(l) “preventing the deterioration of hard landscapes”, an article from the Peace Arch News, March 13, 2009, entitled “Pesticide rules bug city”, was quoted, noting that the use of cosmetic pesticides on hard landscaping comes under provincial purview. It was suggested that there be further clarification from Staff in this regard.

It was determined that item 3(e) “controlling or destroying a Pest which has caused an Infestation ...”, is covered under legislation.

It was Moved by B. Campbell  
 Seconded by B. Stewart  
 That item “3(e)” in the Draft Pesticide  
 Control By-law, be eliminated.  
Carried, with C. Dragomir opposed.

- (b) With reference to the above draft by-law, correspondence dated March 9, 2009, including an attached list of noxious weeds (21 of which pertain to Surrey), from Kathleen Zimmerman, BC Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, was reviewed.

**2. Surrey Ecosystem Management Study Stakeholder Meeting**

File No. 6440-20-2008

As noted at the February 21, 2009 EAC meeting, the above meeting had been postponed. The meeting was rescheduled and held on March 4, 2009. M. Deo and A. Schulze attended the meeting and provided an update to the Committee as follows:

- Well attended (approx. 25- 30), representing various committees and stakeholder groups.
- Purpose was to review inventory mapping.
- 59% of the City met the modelling criteria and was mapped. The largest green area being the river mouth (Mud Bay).
- Reviewed Surrey's previous ESA (high, medium, low) and the new Ecosystem Management.
- Looked at hubs, sites and corridor networks for the ecological mapping system, and noting the different ecosystem benefits.
- Most of the discussion focussed on the corridors - what is a corridor and what makes a corridor. The consultant used computer design models for where the corridors should be.
- Some of the issues included general long term goals, a snap shot of today and future development.
- The computer generated corridors are able to choose the most likely route for wildlife movement between hubs.
- A finer level of detail to determine how wide the corridors will be, based on the various requirements of what is being managed, is needed.
- In theory (if this goes forward) it will be able to guide land use plans, neighbourhood concept plans, etc., ultimately providing an environmental filter on the various plans. There will be a strategic focus on managing wildlife, protecting forest patches, wetlands and other critical habitats and linking them.
- The next step is to further refine the maps and determine how to manage wildlife for the long term (e.g. restrictive covenants, etc.) and the strategies required.
- A second meeting will be scheduled followed by a public open house in order to get as much public input as possible.

C. Dragomir left the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

**3. Mayor Lois Jackson, Chair, Metro Vancouver Board**

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, as referred to the EAC from Council, was deferred at the February 18, 2009 EAC meeting, to be discussed at the March 18, 2009 meeting. Comments were as follows:

- There is a definite problem with the amount of plastic bags in the landfill.
- This initiative should be part of the City's 3R campaign.

- It was noted that the Suzuki Foundation do not advocate a ban. They suggest that cloth bags be used instead of plastic and that if the cloth bag is not available (forgotten at home, etc.), then plastic bags could be used and then reused/recycled from home.
- The public become aware of, and adjust accordingly to, those stores that do not provide plastic bags (e.g. Costco).

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

It was  
Moved by S. Van Keulen  
Seconded by G. Sahota  
That the Environmental Advisory  
Committee recommends to Council that the City of Surrey support Metro  
Vancouver in requesting a province-wide ban of single-use, disposable shopping  
bags.

Carried

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

**1. Corporate Report R023  
2009 Salmon Habitat and Restoration (“SHaRP”) Program  
File: 4809-901**

At the Regular Council meeting held on Monday, March 9, 2009, Council referred Corporate Report R023 to the Environmental Advisory Committee for information.

It was  
Moved by B. Stewart  
Seconded by M. Deo  
That Corporate Report R023, 2009 Salmon  
Habitat and Restoration (“SHaRP”) Program, be received.  
Carried

**F. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**1. Development Advisory Committee (“DAC”)**

G. Sahota provided an update from the recent DAC meeting, noting the following:

- With regard to development in areas where there is a certain allotment of land for parks, the developers were requesting that the parks be in place prior to the completion of subdivisions, rather than after completion, as:
  - there is added value to the homes; and

- the aesthetic of the land is in place that assures purchasers that there will be no further building on those lands.
- Building permits have reduced substantially.
- Land prices have dropped.

**G. CORRESPONDENCE**

**1. Brita Colero, Community Action Coordinator, Delta/Surrey/White Rock, Canadian Cancer Society, Fraser Valley Region**

The letter dated March 17, 2009, together with attachments, from Brita Colero, Community Action Coordinator, Delta/Surrey/White Rock, Canadian Cancer Society, Fraser Valley Region, regarding the development of a pesticide-use by-law in Surrey, was reviewed.

It was  
Moved by S. Van Keulen  
Seconded by B. Stewart  
That the letter, dated March 17, 2009, from  
Brita Colero, Community Action Coordinator, Delta/Surrey/White Rock,  
Canadian Cancer Society, Fraser Valley Region, be received.  
Carried

**H. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS**

**1. EAC 2009 Priority Items & Work Plan**

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

**I. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the EAC will be held on April 15, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

It was  
Moved by M. Deo  
Seconded by B. Campbell  
That the Environmental Advisory  
Committee meeting do now adjourn.  
Carried

The Environmental Advisory Committee adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

---

Jane Sowik, City Clerk

---

Al Schulze, Chairperson  
Environmental Advisory Committee