

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATION INDEX
Wednesday, July 21, 2004**

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Management of Interface Zones

It was Moved by R. Wetzel
Seconded by B. Stilwell
That the Chair of the Environmental Advisory Committee contact the
Chair of the Agricultural Advisory Committee to discuss the issue of buffer zones to determine if there is
something that can be done jointly on the issue of management of interface zones.
Carried

G. UPDATES

2. Environmentally Sensitive Areas

It was Moved by R. Zelinka
Seconded by Councillor Bose
Whereas the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) is a cornerstone of achieving a sustainable
City; and

Whereas Surrey's ESAs were identified in 1990, and incorporated in the OCP in 1992, and have not been
updated since that time; and

Whereas a 1997 review of the ESAs which identifies many additional areas of high value was never presented
to Council or the public, nor included in the OCP; and

Whereas policies and implementing actions listed in the OCP to promote conservation of the 1990 version of
the ESAs have mostly not been carried out (except for stream protection); and

Whereas detailed environmental studies have been conducted for only about 3 of the 18 neighbourhood
concept plans which have been completed;

Therefore the Environmental Advisory Committee recommends that Council include in its 2005 budget and
work plan an update of Surrey's ESAs for inclusion in the OCP and preparation of conservation plans,
including implementation strategies and public information for each ESA of high value, for consideration by
Council.

Carried with B. Stilwell Against

City of Surrey

***Environmental Advisory Committee
Minutes***

Executive Boardroom
City Hall
14245 - 56 Avenue
Surrey, B.C.
WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2004
Time: 7:00 p.m.

Present:

Dr. R.M. Strang - Chair
H. Locke
D. Maher
B. Stilwell

Absent:

Dr. T. Godwin
J. Grewal
Dr. F. Perello
J. Lotzkar

Staff Present:

R. Jones, Staff Liaison, Engineering Department
K. Swaele, Legislative Services

R. Wetzel
R. Zelinka
Councillor Bose

S. VanKeulen

Agricultural Advisory Committee
Representative

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

1. Environmental Advisory Committee - Minutes of June 16, 2004.

It was Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by H. Locke
That the minutes of the Environmental Advisory committee meeting of
June 16, 2004 be adopted.

Before the motion was put, R. Zelinka distributed an amendment to the minutes that she felt reflected the discussions on the Campbell Heights Land Use Plan and the Campbell Heights Business Park Development Concept Plan.

The Environmental Advisory Committee discussed the amendment, and it was noted that the minutes are generally brief, reflecting topics discussed and actions taken.

It was Moved by R. Zelinka
Seconded by R. Bose
That the minutes of the Environmental Advisory committee meeting of
June 16, 2004 be amended on page 5, at Item D3, Campbell Heights by adding the following:

“The Committee reviewed excerpts from the Campbell Heights Land Use Plan and the Campbell Heights Business Park Development Concept Plan regarding protection of environmental areas. The staff liaison explained how her department is establishing the main environmental feature in Phase 1 of the proposed industrial area. This is a 66m wide wildlife corridor along the 194 Street road alignment between Latimer Lake and 20th Avenue. It will be fenced off, except where it crosses roads. Pedestrian walkways will be outside this corridor.

It was noted that the woodlands west of 192nd Street where the Land Use Plan suggests there may be tree stands worth preserving are Alder, and not worth preserving.”

Carried

It was Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by D. Maher
That the minutes of the Environmental Advisory committee meeting of
June 16, 2004 be adopted, as amended.

Carried

2. Closed Environmental Advisory Committee – Minutes of June 16, 2004.

Before the motion was put on the Closed Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting minutes of June 16, 2004, R. Zelinka distributed an amendment to be considered on Page 1, Item A, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, to reflect the discussion that was held on ESAs.

It was Moved by R. Zelinka
Seconded by R. Bose
That the minutes of the Closed Environmental Advisory committee
meeting of June 16, 2004 be amended on Page 1, Item A, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, by adding a
paragraph before “The following issues were discussed” as follows:

“A general comparison was made between the ESA designated in the OCP in 1990 and the map of ESAs contained in the 1997 Update Report. It was noted that the Update contains many more ESAs of high value.

It was wondered why this study has never been presented to Council and made available to the public.”

Carried

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose

Seconded by R. Wetzel

That the minutes of the Closed Environmental Advisory committee meeting of June 16, 2004 be adopted, as amended.

Carried

D. Maher asked that it be noted that Council had deemed the Closed meeting to be an open meeting, and that this be reflected in the minutes.

B. DELEGATION

C. DISCUSSION OF DELEGATION

D. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

1. Sampling – Elgin Creek

Correspondence of June 9, 2004 from Dr. J. Blair Wallace, P.Eng., regarding the above.

The Environmental Advisory Committee discussed the samples and noted:

- That the numbers on table 6, page 17, May 2004 appear to have been transposed, and should be clarified.
- That the number of samples (3) may not have been adequate to represent the whole site.
- That the sample for cadmium was sent to a laboratory that could not measure within the criteria limits.
- That it should be determined which criteria have been used, i.e., drinking water, aquatic life, recreational.
- That it should be determined whether any ground water sampling has been done.
- That part of the water flowing in Elgin Creek and some of the drainage ditches is partially surface run off and likely includes ground water seepage, so without groundwater data it is difficult to determine (if there is contamination) where it is coming from.
- That interpretation of figure 1 would be improved with the addition of contour lines, and a delineation of the landfill area.
- That it should be clarified whether the properties to the north of the sampling area (one acre properties on septic fields) and some of the analysis sites were chosen to see if there is leachate from the septic fields.
- That the Committee questions the comment on Page 3 of the report under Discussion that “the analytical results show that the landfill is having no identifiable impact on Elgin Creek at this time. In fact, the analytical results show that as Elgin Creek flows across the Site, the water quality improves”.
- That it appears that the consultant does not have strong enough data to establish his conclusions.

The Environmental Advisory Committee asked that the Drainage & Environment Manager seek clarification on the issues that have been raised and bring the information back to the Committee in due course.

2. City of Surrey Community Vision – "Future Surrey Vision"

Corporate Report of October 5, 1995 and accompanying brochure.

The Environmental Advisory Committee expressed disappointment that there is apparently little reference to the Future Surrey Vision in current development planning.

R. Zelinka noted that a vision is part of a planning process that generally leads to the next step, which is usually an Official Community Plan.

R. Zelinka noted that what appears to happen in Surrey is that there is an annual review of the Official

Community Plan, which incorporates updates. Although many of the vision items seem to be in the Community Plan in one way or another, there are other things that could have been done if this had gone to the next stage, which does not appear to have been done.

R. Wetzel noted that there are instances of the Vision being used in the City of Surrey such as in Campbell Heights, incorporation of green space into development, integration of bike paths, and stream preservation.

3. Environmental Almanac

This item was moved forward to Item G. 3 – Work Plan.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Management of Interface Zones

The Chair commented that the Environmental Advisory Committee could help Council develop a policy for interface zones between areas such as residential and agriculture, industrial and agriculture, industrial and residential. He noted that there is currently no policy for dealing with these buffer zones or issues, such as who will manage them, and how they are to be maintained.

R. Wetzel advised that the Agricultural Advisory Committee has been working on setbacks for agricultural zones, and that anything the Environmental Advisory Committee decides to undertake should be done in consultation with the Agricultural Advisory Committee.

R. Jones, Staff Liaison, Engineering Department noted that she has seen some new applications for higher density residential adjacent to agricultural land and they do include buffering as part of the development.

R. Jones continued that there are extensive restrictive covenants placed on residential areas adjacent to agricultural so that new residents are aware of the impact of agriculture, and that the City has been doing background work on the issue.

R. Zelinka noted that the Official Community Plan does show buffer zones between residential and agricultural, but there are no guidelines, which means the whole thing is ineffective.

Councillor Bose noted that there are staff in the Ministry of Agriculture who are familiar with the concept of “green zones”, and who are a good resource for the City of Surrey.

H. Locke expressed that this is a large and complex issue and there may not be a solution that fits all situations.

It was

Moved by R. Wetzel

Seconded by B. Stilwell

That the Chair of the Environmental Advisory Committee contact the

Chair of the Agricultural Advisory Committee to discuss the issue of buffer zones to determine if there is something that can be done jointly on the issue of management of interface zones.

Carried

F. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

G. UPDATES

1. Outstanding Items

The Environmental Advisory Committee reviewed the Outstanding Action List.

R. Zelinka asked if Committee members were willing to do work outside of the Committee meetings to spend

extra time on projects for the Committee.

R. Zelinka noted that if there are not a lot of Committee members who have time for extra projects, the Committee should focus on those things that are most important. She noted that she has prepared a draft work plan for the Committee's consideration.

2. Spring Clean Up

H. Locke commented that at the last Transfer Station meeting in June the Solid Waste Manager indicated that the goal of staff was to abolish the annual spring clean up.

Councillor Bose noted that Corporate Report R178, July 19, 2004 recommends significant change to the program. Council has tabled this to a much wider discussion, so that they have some time to discuss the issue with staff before taking any measures.

Councillor Bose asked that the Environmental Advisory Committee receive copies of Report R178 with the next Agenda Package.

R. Wetzel noted that the Spring Clean Up program seems to have been very successful until this year, and that there has been confusion associated with opening of the Transfer Station. He expressed concern that people will not make an effort to transport waste to the transfer station, and that it will end up in ditches, which will cost the City of Surrey a significant amount to clean up. Garbage is also unsightly and will not create an image of a "clean" Surrey.

3. Environmentally Sensitive Areas

R. Zelinka expressed concern that the ESAs have not been reviewed since 1990 and noted that she has done some investigation on her own and noted an area west of 172nd street and south of 32nd avenue. The area is about 60 acres in the North Grandview neighbourhood concept plan and is shown as 1-acre lots, which allows 15% of the woodland to be protected.

R. Zelinka continued that this piece was not in the original 1990's plan and was identified in the 1997 study, but was completely ignored in 1998.

R. Zelinka noted that she found this by looking at only one neighbourhood concept plan. She commented that staff may argue that instead of dealing with this through the Official Community Plan they are dealing with this through the Neighbourhood Concept Plan, but it is her opinion that this is not good enough, and Council should be asked to authorize a review of the Environmentally Sensitive Areas.

It was
Moved by R. Zelinka
Seconded by Councillor Bose

Whereas the protection of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) is a cornerstone of achieving a sustainable City; and

Whereas Surrey's ESAs were identified in 1990, and incorporated in the OCP in 1992, and have not been updated since that time; and

Whereas a 1997 review of the ESAs which identifies many additional areas of high value was never presented to Council or the public, nor included in the OCP; and

Whereas policies and implementing actions listed in the OCP to promote conservation of the 1990 version of the ESAs have mostly not been carried out (except for stream protection); and

Whereas detailed environmental studies have been conducted for only about 3 of the 18 neighbourhood concept plans which have been completed;

Therefore the Environmental Advisory Committee recommends that Council include in its 2005 budget and work plan an update of Surrey's ESAs for inclusion in the OCP and preparation of conservation plans,

including implementation strategies and public information for each ESA of high value, for consideration by Council.

Carried with B. Stilwell Against

R. Jones, Engineering Department Liaison, noted the excellent job Surrey has done protecting streams, and fish habitat. Wildlife habitat and potential corridors are being looked at and they want to develop a vision of what Surrey will look like in the future and what wildlife it can sustain.

R. Jones continued by noting that Neighbourhood Concept Plans such as Port Kells, Grandview Heights and Campbell Heights started with environmental studies. In terms of wildlife usage there has not been strong legislation, but this is changing in terms of the new *Species at Risk Act*.

The Committee noted that there might be a lack of strategy in an NCP towards achieving environmental goals, and a tendency to maximize use of the land from an investment perspective.

That although the City does look at environmental issues when dealing with developments, it does not address how these lands can be acquired or managed for environmental protection.

4. Work Plan

R. Zelinka presented a draft work plan for the Environmental Advisory Committee, as follows:

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee respectfully presents the following work program for Council's approval. It is made on the assumption that, as is the current situation, no staff help will be available unless specifically requested from Council.

- 1. That the EAC have representation on the steering committee for the ESA review, if Council decides to proceed with it and have input to that project at each major step in the process.*
- 2. That the EAC form a sub-committee to develop sustainable and environmental indicators which would form a base line for measuring Surrey's future performance as a sustainable city. Indicators used would include those identified as “quality of community indicators” in the OCP, and some of those used by the GVRD and the City of Richmond, e.g. air and water quality, area of ESAs, areas of parks, area of ALR, number of trees planted per year, % of waste recycled. Some staff assistance would be desirable to gather and collate statistics held in municipal departments. The results would be presented to Council in 2005.*
- 3. That the EAC form a subcommittee to prepare an environmental almanac for distribution to the public. A budget of is requested for printing and public distribution, plus some staff assistance. This almanac would be distributed early in 2005.*
- 4. That in the preparation of each secondary plan and in each review of policies related to environmental matters, the EAC be consulted both at the preliminary stage and at the final draft stage. The EAC would also be consulted during the review process for development applications, which affect ESAs identified in 1990 or 1997 or by the proposed ESA review.*
- 5. That in view of advances in environmental protection and stewardship, the EAC investigate the criteria used to prioritize City purchase of environmentally sensitive lands, and report back to Council.*
- 6. That the General Manager of the Planning and Development Department be requested to attend an EAC meeting to discuss using planning legislation to protect environmentally sensitive areas.*
- 7. That during the spring of 2005 the EAC organize a bus tour of environmentally interesting sites, for Council, senior staff, and advisory committees. Funding for the bus rental is requested.*
- 8. That EAC members be funded to attend an environmental conference each year, concerning topics relevant to Surrey, as is permitted for at least one other advisory committee.”*

The Environmental Advisory Committee discussed R.Zelinka's proposed work plan and noted:

- That the Committee has looked at many of these suggestions in the past, such as a steering committee to provide input on development projects and processes.
- That there are many other organizations looking at sustainable environmental indicators, and a lot of data has been collected through monitoring done by other levels of government, such as the GVRD, Ministries of Environment and Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- That perhaps next year's SHaRP team could be dedicated to gathering the sustainable environmental indicators as they work with other agencies, and which would be a useful learning experience for them as well.
- That, as Surrey is the 10th largest City in Canada, perhaps it would be worthwhile asking the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to break Surrey out when it does its quality of life study.

R. Zelinka will look into whether it would be possible to have the Federation of Canadian Municipalities break out quality of life statistics for the City of Surrey.

It was
Moved by B. Stilwell
Seconded by H. Locke
That the work plan presented by R. Zelinka be tabled, pending a decision
by Council relevant to the Environmental Advisory Committee motion regarding Environmentally Sensitive
Areas.

Carried with R. Zelinka Against

(d) Border Infrastructure Program

The Environmental Advisory Committee noted that the consultants on the Border Infrastructure Program did meet with the Agricultural Advisory Committee and should be able to meet with the Environmental Advisory Committee. The Chair will call the consultants to determine a suitable time for them to meet with the EAC.

H. CORRESPONDENCE

**1. Charleston Green Strata Plan No-2625
6537 – 138 Street, Surrey**

Correspondence of June 21, 2004 from Bayside Property Services Ltd.

R. Jones, Engineering Liaison, noted that the Drainage and Environment Manager has met with the residents and it looks like the problem with bank erosion may be the result of last winter's storms. The City of Surrey will look at what can be done to stabilize the site.

The issue of vegetation may not be viable due to the heavy conifer cover, which would prevent growth. In lieu of this, the property owners have asked that a chain link fence be put in place to prevent unauthorized use of the area. The Engineering Department is looking into this, and the Parks Department is also aware of the situation and looking at methods that can be used to prevent unauthorized usage.

I. INFORMATION ITEMS

It was
Moved by R. Wetzel
Seconded by D. Maher
That the information items be received.
Carried

1. Council Resolutions – June 21, 2004

Memorandum of June 23, 2004 from Legislative Services.

2. Boundary Bay Clean-up

Colour photographs will be placed on-table, from Surrey Environmental Partners regarding the invasive species clean-up which took place June 17 – 19, 2004.

J. OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

1. Sustainability and New Development in Delta with Options for the Delsom Lands

Corporate Report of June 1, 2004 (Corporation of Delta). This was deferred to September.

K. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be At the Call of the Chair or on September 15, 2004, at 7:00 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

L. ADJOURNMENT

The Environmental Advisory Committee adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Margaret Jones, City Clerk

Dr. R. Strang, Chair
Environmental Advisory Committee