

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION INDEX
Wednesday, June 16, 2004**

D. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. GVRD Waste Transfer Station

It was Moved by S. VanKeulen
Seconded by F. Perello
That the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) endorses the annual Spring Clean Up Program because of its positive environmental benefits. However in order to mitigate the volume overload and subsequent problems at the GVRD Transfer Station, that consideration be given to staggering the program by dates and/or zones.
Carried

City of Surrey

*Environmental Advisory Committee
Minutes*

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2004
Time: 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Dr. R.M. Strang - Chair
Dr. T. Godwin
Dr. F. Perello
H. Locke
R. Wetzel
D. Maher
B. Stilwell
R. Zelinka
Councillor Bose

Absent:

J. Grewal
J. Lotzkar

**Agricultural Advisory Committee
Representative**

S. VanKeulen

Staff Present:

C. Baron, Drainage & Environment Manager
K. Miller, Legislative Services

Also Present:

D. Riley, Chair, Conservation Committee of
Naturalists White Rock/Surrey

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Environmental Advisory Committee – Minutes of May 19, 2004

It was Moved by B. Stilwell
Seconded by R. Wetzel
That the minutes of the Environmental Advisory committee meeting of May 19, 2004 be amended to reflect that in the List of Outstanding Items, include "Development Application east of Nico Wynd", and adopted.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS

C. DISCUSSION OF DELEGATIONS

D. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. GVRD Waste Transfer Station

The Chair informed the committee that the following motion was not voted on at the last meeting, and further stated that the committee may wish to vote on the motion as stated, or withdraw the motion if it is no longer applicable.

There followed a discussion relative to recent activities at the site, at which time T. Godwin stated that it appears that the problems with odour and volume of garbage have been resolved.

H. Locke indicated that in discussion with the GVRD, he was re-assured that issues relative to liability concerning residential green waste, signage, and site locations for composting have been resolved. Mr. Locke further explained that the GVRD are very supportive of concerns and are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Concerns are requested in writing with specifics including time, date and details of problems.

C. Baron informed the committee that there is a telephone hotline at the GVRD where complaints are received, and the GVRD makes every effort to address concerns. The hotline number is 604-436-6777.

H. Locke stated that the GVRD have received one complaint since April 2004 when the facility first opened. Seventy-two trailers are available and thirty trucks are dispatched daily. Unfortunately, during the Spring Clean Up period, the facility was not equipped to deal with the higher volumes of waste which is received. During that time, over 200 trucks were received daily, concurrently with other municipal Clean Up programs. Further, it was noted that high-powered lights which are turned on during daylight hours, are energy efficient and increase health and safety conditions for those persons present at the facility.

The motion was then withdrawn.

Councillor Bose stated the need for other centralized transfer facilities for residential use rather than commercial use. There are concerns that the annual Spring Clean Up, while successful, people in other municipalities may be taking advantage of the facility for uses outside of its intended purpose. Should other facilities be considered, it would benefit the City of Surrey to consider clean up programs which would occur more than once per year. Councillor Bose stressed the need for other more efficient programs.

R. Wetzel stated that his observations in May occurred one week following the Clean Up, that no trucks were visible exiting the facility and that the amount of waste was piled at dangerous levels. It was understood that the volume during that two-week period is extraordinary, and exacerbated the start-up issues of the facility.

B. Stilwell stated that developing other locations for similar facilities should be delayed until such time as a study of the operations of the existing facility is conducted. Prior to the Spring Clean Up program being implemented, it was not unusual to observe larger waste items being dumped by roadsides.

S. VanKeulen stated that the community benefits from the program, and that it is well functioning, and provides an incentive for residents to recycle.

T. Godwin suggested that the program length be shortened, and divide by district in order to facilitate the turnover of the waste.

F. Perello queried whether the program may be opened to the public twice per year, rather than annually, in order to decrease volume overall.

D. Maher queried whether Surrey may request that other municipalities hold similar programs during the same time, so as to decrease the opportunity to transfer waste to neighbouring municipalities illegally.

It was
Moved by S. VanKeulen
Seconded by F. Perello
That the Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) endorses the annual Spring Clean Up Program because of its positive environmental benefits. However in order to mitigate the volume overload and subsequent problems at the GVRD Transfer Station, that consideration be given to staggering the program by dates and/or zones.

Carried

2. 2004 Work Plan

The committee reviewed the list of indicators provided by Dr. Perello, and discussed the following issues:

- Practices and policies;
- Stewardship, education and environmental projects;
- Greenspaces and environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs);
- Land use and housing developments;
- Water quality studies for main, secondary, surface, drinking, and ground water quality;
- Air quality;
- Soil quality;
- Resource consumption;
- Waste generation and management;
- Transportation of good, freight and cargo; and
- Noise levels and mitigation strategies.

The committee then considered initiating a formal work plan through the study of trends, rather than the state of the environment at any given time. The following concerns were considered:

- Information concerning parks and protected areas should be kept confidential;
- Resources required include staff, consultants and budget;
- Comparison of other municipalities' studies;
- Light pollution should be added to the list of indicators;
- Emphasis should be placed on tangible benefits to the City;
- A permanent record of the state of the environment should be developed;
- Methodology should be developed to identify trends and should be conducted by an objective party, such as an auditor, or consultant;
- Data required for water quality testing, air quality, energy consumption (other data may be accessed from the GVRD);
- Rather than focusing solely on Surrey, the GVRD should be approached to conduct studies for the entire Lower Mainland;
- The committee should use one or two topics contained within the list of indicators and prioritize accordingly;
- Refer to "Future Surrey Vision" for consideration of issues to address;
- Consider data for an environmental almanac.

C. Baron was requested to obtain a copy of "Future Surrey Vision" and provide a report at the next meeting. The Administrative Assistant was requested to remind members to retain the existing documentation of the two previous meeting agendas, in order to conserve paper.

R. Zelinka will contact the GVRD to obtain further information and will forward to the Administrative Assistant a sustainability study conducted by the Corporation of Delta. .

3. Campbell Heights

The committee considered the development of Campbell Heights, including traffic impact studies and Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) as follows:

- Campbell Heights land use plan;
- Wildlife corridors and conceptual habitat plan;
- Campbell Heights Business Park development concept plan;
- Tree preservation opportunities;
- Mining activities (Stokes Pit);
- Maintenance and water protection measures;
- Oil / grease interceptors on development sites;

- More stringent sediment controls;
- Bio-filtration swales on City property; and
- Pedestrian corridors.

4. City Website

Staff presented the City's website for information.

E. NEW BUSINESS

F. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

Councillor Bose left the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

G. UPDATES

1. List of Outstanding Items

The committee was requested to review the list of outstanding items and provide direction accordingly.

Elgin Creek Estates

This item will be forwarded to the next agenda. It was noted that the water is filtering well, and nothing is leaching off the site.

Environmental Almanac

Information may be published in hard copy and disseminated to the public through public facilities. It was noted that additional information may also be added to the website. Feasibility concerns including funding were considered. Staff explained that a business plan/funding proposal is required for Council's consideration of budget and staff resources for this project. Areas targeted for distribution should be selected to minimize public disposal of the material. An electronic copy needs to be incorporated into the Surrey website to maximize its use.

Councillor Bose returned to the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

This item will be forwarded to the next agenda.

H. CORRESPONDENCE

I. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Water Conservation – City Website

Surrey's Water Metre Program.

2. Working Session to Remove Invasive Species from Boundary Bay

E-correspondence of June 7, 2004 from Kevin Purton. It was noted that Drayton Harbour Shellfish District are hosting an open house and oyster feed on June 19, 2004, 12:00 p.m. at the Blaine Harbour Port Conference Room, 235 Marine Drive, Blaine, WA.

3. Proposed Riparian Area Regulations – Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection

The committee reviewed Corporate Report No. R128 of June 7, 2004 and discussed the following issues:

- Current provincial activity with respect to the regulations;
- The province has limited municipal involvement to date;
- It was noted that Council authorized the City Clerk to forward a copy of the report to the provincial and federal governments, as well as the Union of British Columbia Municipalities (UBCM) and further requested that the enactment of the regulations be delayed to allow for meaningful open consultation with local government regarding the content of and processes for implementing such changes.
- If adopted, the enactment will place more responsibility on local governments for the administration of environmental legislation which in effect will be downloading with no transfer of resources;
- Changes to the regulations will introduce additional uncertainty in the development in the development process, which does not appear to have been given adequate consideration to date;
- Additionally, the new regulations need to be fully coordinated with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' processes so that there is a "one-window" approach to approvals;
- Surrey's legal position is that the setbacks may be adjusted based on other criteria than fish and riparian needs; and
- Several municipalities are coordinating to approach the two senior levels of government with a view to ensuring that municipalities are consulted prior to enactment.

J. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

K. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be held on July 21, 2004 at 7:00 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

L. MOTION TO HOLD MEETING IN A CLOSED SESSION

It was Moved by R. Zelinka
Seconded by Councillor Bose
That the Environmental Advisory Committee close the meeting to the
public pursuant to Section 90 (e), of the Community Charter.
Carried

M. ADJOURNMENT

The Environmental Advisory Committee adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Dr. R. Strang, Chair, Environmental Advisory Committee