

Present:

A. Schulze - Chair
Councillor Bose
B. Burnside
C. Dragomir
M. Harcourt
G. Sahota
G. Sangha
B. Stewart

Regrets:

B. Campbell
K. Keshvani

**Agricultural Advisory Committee
Representative:**

S. VanKeulen

Staff Present:

C. Baron, Drainage and Environmental
Manager
D. Luymes, Manager, Community
Planning Division
A. Mathewson, Manager, Sustainability
B. Parghi, Planning & Development
L. Anderson, Legislative Services

A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved by C. Dragomir
Seconded by B. Stewart
That the minutes of the Environmental
Advisory Committee meeting held on July 28, 2010, be adopted.
Carried

B. DELEGATIONS**1. Anna Mathewson, Manager, Sustainability**

Anna Mathewson, Manager, Sustainability, provided some background and an update on the Sustainability Charter indicators and targets. Comments were as follows:

- The Sustainability Charter, an overarching policy document, has a 50 year vision (to 2058), which includes a set of goals that will guide the City's future actions and decisions.
- The action framework is based on:
 - The 3 Pillars of Sustainability: Socio-Cultural, Economic and Environmental;
 - The City's 3 Spheres of Influence: Corporate/City operations, areas of Municipal Jurisdiction and areas of Municipal Influence; and
 - Short, medium and long term time frames.
- The City's ability to achieve its Vision requires the setting of targets through measuring progress, accountability, public reporting and bringing together existing measures into one place.
- A task force, which includes community representation and volunteer members from the various advisory committees, was established one year ago.
- The task force had a number of brainstorming meetings to establish a number of indicators and quite a significant amount of time was spent on the

environmental sectors. The initial list of indicators was then prioritized to 100. After consultation with staff from various departments, and looking at the reliable data that was already available (didn't want to collect new data), a refined list was drafted and presented to Council in June.

- Follow-up/refinement of the indicator list and collection of baseline data was carried out during the summer and further presentations to the various advisory committees will be made throughout September and October.
- Surrey is proactive in establishing targets; looking at a long term 20-58 year vision with short term stage targets in-between. Some targets are quite specific (e.g. environmental targets such as water quality, etc.) and some targets are general (ie. looking for a trend up or trend down).
- The task force has asked to be involved on an ongoing basis to review annual data updates and reporting and to provide any further feedback or suggested revisions.

The Committee's comments and questions were noted and answered as follows:

- On the Boundary Bay issue, Surrey is only one of several players. Are we going to be able to factor out our contribution from the other jurisdictions?

Yes, measures can be taken at the borders – we know what is coming in and going out. Last year, the Ministry of Environment did some data collection too. Puget Sound also did some work, so we definitely know what's coming that way too.

- The real focus is mostly on immediate and future, but are there any benchmarks that go back a decade or so?

Yes, we have some from the 70's and 80's. Right now we are looking at the guidelines and how we compare with those. We can look at the change, but it is more relevant to see where we are going.

- How do we get around? How much energy are we using as a community? There are few buses and an ever increasing volume of traffic. Are we going to have any handle at all on our consumption of fossil fuels in both the private and public sectors?

Community energy and emissions inventory data – there is data on transportation emissions that we will be tracking. The data is based on a trip diary (not mileage).

- The Committee might want to strongly recommend a measure program of all vehicles within the city. It would be good to have accurate data as there is a serious gap in the data base when you think of what we do with our vehicles, it is very significant.
- As a pilot program, perhaps a distance based insurance program could be considered, as done in Oregon. Insurance companies would be required to report the mileage as an annual report, which would not only provide better data, but has the advantage of encouraging people to carpool and drive less.

A review of the "Sustainability Dashboard" that has been created was provided. The Dashboard, mainly a web based tool, is for the broader community. It will include indicators, background (relevance to sustainability, etc.), baseline information and short and long term targets. It is anticipated that the Dashboard

will be presented to Council in November, which, if supported, will be incorporated into the City's website and rolled out to the community in early 2011.

On another matter, the Committee was asked if there was an interest in having a role in a sustainability award. At present there are a few award ideas being considered (i.e. building design, beautification). The Committee advised that a similar discussion has been on the EAC's table for a year or so regarding the possibility of the EAC having an ongoing program of recognition by nominating individuals, firms and/or organizations for environmental stewardship which could ultimately lead to an annual award of some sort.

It was suggested that there could be two levels of recognition established, one that is more formal and city wide that is based on recommendations to Council for a major award and then a second level of acknowledgement to those individuals in neighbourhoods or organizations, etc. that encourage environmental stewardship.

A. Mathewson left the meeting at 7:11 p.m.

**2. Bhargav Parghi, Senior Planner and
Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division
Planning and Development**

As the NCP for Grandview Heights Area #4 is in the early planning stages, Bhargav Parghi, Senior Planner, and Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division, Planning and Development, were in attendance to present information, which included the planning vision and principles and features/highlights of three land base concepts, and to seek feedback from the Committee. A PowerPoint presentation was also given and comments were as follows:

- A number of background studies have been completed to provide input into the Grandview Heights area NCPs including the following environmental studies:
 - Ecosystem Management Plan – Citywide Study;
 - Environmental Assessment Report (Madrone Study) – Environmental Study of the Grandview Heights Area (except NCP Areas #1 and #2); and
 - Erickson Creek Integrated Stormwater Management Study (ISMP).
- Both the Ecosystem Management Study and Madrone Study identified large natural areas of significant environmental value in Area #4, including significant forest stands and fish and wildlife habitats.
- The Ecosystem Management Study identifies high priority hubs and corridors for protection.
- The Madrone Study findings included large contiguous and relatively intact forested areas of moderate/moderately high arboricultural value and high habitat value supporting biodiversity. The forested area north of 24 Avenue is ranked “very high” as a wildlife hub, and the area to the south, while not ranked as high, facilitates wildlife movement.
- Recommendations from the ISMP include a series of detention ponds located on the uplands along the ALR boundary and in the interior of the NCP area, and on-site low impact development and best management practices.

- The projected build-out is approximately 1,750-2,750 units and a population of 4,460-6,800. Population is relatively the same in each of the land use options, the differences are reflected in the distribution.
- Full build out of the area will generate a need for some sort of neighbourhood commercial and an elementary school too.
- Although Option 3 also shows plans for commercial on 176 Street, it is likely to change, as the kind of commercial sought will be neighbourhood commercial, not for highway traffic.
- In terms of green, natural space, the natural hubs, etc., Option 1 has the least amount of open space compared to Option 3, which provides linkages and has more continuous spaces.
- Of the three land use options proposed, green corridors are more continuous in Option 2 than that in Option 1. Option 3 proposes a higher density in green spaces. Additionally, it appears that development is fairly close to agriculture (although there is an agreement with agricultural land to increase density further away from agricultural land in order to create a larger buffer). However one of the challenges there is that the very best wildlife areas are further up the hill, which means in order to protect the wildlife areas, development may be considered a little closer to the agricultural land.

The Committee's comments were as follows:

- There are a number of watercourses that flow through here. There are flooding issues, habitat protection issues related to the creek and the land slopes to the ALR with significant creeks below.
- It appears that none of the land use options provide enough of a wildlife corridor.
- The options presented really need to have some sort of EMS light on them. The options may look fine as shown, but when you see what is there now, almost all of it is wildlife.
- There really doesn't appear to be a huge difference in the amount of green space in one scheme to the other and the separation from the land reserve is very minimal. Anyone in the ALR will not see one scheme is different from the other. These boundaries are very arbitrary, and there is a consequence. Until you lay over ecological management areas and see what you have left over, it is difficult to comment.
- We just can't look at these without knowing what is left. Take the environmentally sensitive issues and then take any one of these schemes and do the subtraction, then they can be better understood.
- Also missing from any of our plans is how you go about making a small neighbourhood commercial centres viable. There are very few examples. You can't treat neighbourhood commercial like all other commercials. If it is going to be viable, it has to have some elements to it. The fundamentals of what makes a neighbourhood commercially viable hasn't been addressed.
- When talking about arterial roads, etc., there never seems to be a park and ride. There should be that opportunity, a facility in the NCP where there is a set of roadways or trails that lead to a park and ride opportunity; if built, they will come. The South Surrey park and ride, with a 4-5 acre site, is filled every week. Every one of the park and ride facilities at present have been a success

from the start, people are getting on a bus, parking and getting on a bus, however, not one of the options seen here addresses that need.

- In cycling and walking, what makes the transit hub successful is being accessible.

B. Parghi left the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

1. Grandview Heights #4 Area NCP

The Committee passed a motion at the July 28, 2010 meeting to recommend that the EAC be fully engaged in the Grandview Heights Area #4 NCP through its stages of development. Council will receive the Minutes of that meeting and any Committee Recommendation(s) at the October 4, 2010 Regular Council Public Hearing meeting.

2. By-law Introduction: Surrey Soil Removal Area Designation By law, 2010, No. 17214 File: 3900-20-17214; 4520-80

As noted at the July EAC meeting, Council adjourned the Public Hearing on this item until September 13, 2010. An update from the Public Hearing of September 13, 2010 was provided. As the item has already been the subject of a Public Hearing, the Committee was unable to provide any comment.

B. Burnside left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

3. Pesticide Control By-law

The Committee was reminded that significant time will be set aside to review the Pesticide Control By-law for updates at the October meeting. Additional comments were as follows:

- Establishing more of a working document should be the goal.
- The Federal and Provincial schedules, that dictate information on pesticides and how to use them, will be made available for the October meeting. The idea is that it would be better to simply reference the schedules rather than providing an absolute list. For example, if a new pesticide is introduced as “domestic”, it would fall under the domestic schedule, so it would simply be a case of stipulating in the by-law that domestic pesticides are exempt, then that whole class is exempted.
- Would like to know ahead of time what, if any, feedback there has been received from the general public.

It was Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by C. Dragomir
That the Environmental Advisory Committee
requests a staff update with respect to any responses as a result of the
implementation of the Pesticide Control By-law.
Carried

D. NEW BUSINESS

E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

1. **Corporate Report R186
Sustainability Charter Actions Update**
File: 0512-02

Corporate Report R186, Sustainability Charter Actions Update, as referred by to the Committee by Council at the September 13, 2010 Regular Council Public Hearing meeting, was reviewed briefly by the Manager, Community Planning Division. Draft copies of the Sustainable Development Checklist ("Checklist") were provided on table and comments were as follows:

- One of the key actions in the Sustainability Charter was to develop a checklist to encourage new development and buildings that support and advance Surrey's sustainability objectives.
- In developing the Checklist, staff have worked closely with the Sustainability Task Force, the Development Advisory Committee and other stakeholders.
- The Checklist is intended to be relatively user friendly and relatively easy to fill out. If it is too onerous, then it won't be supported.
- The intent is to provide greener developments a way to distinguish themselves to what makes them green and to have support from the development community.
- Some municipalities have had a similar "score card" type of idea. Surrey's Checklist has been given more of a narrative approach and incentive approach.
- Having the Checklist in places will also help to educate and inform developers of green alternatives they can consider early in application process.
- The Checklist will also help track indicators and related development information; in aggregate over time, are we becoming greener?
- Checklist sections ask for different information at each stage which provides an opportunity to determine next steps as the development progresses (e.g. there may be some information available at the time of a development permit or rezoning application, however there are still a number of questions that aren't known until the building permit stage).
- What we have tried to do is to make sure that the information asking for is information that the developer has at hand. Don't want to trigger new consultants having to be hired in order to assist with this; want to make sure it is simple, the information is available and that it is pretty concise.

- The benefit of this system is not intended to punish development, it simply highlights opportunities to provide greener development which will, in turn, highlight those that go above and beyond.
- The Checklist will have the flexibility to be tweaked as changes are needed.
- As the Checklist develops, information will be brought to the Committee for review and comment.

The Chair expressed appreciation for the review and asked the Committee to provide any feedback they may have at the October meeting.

F. CORRESPONDENCE

G. INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) Update

An update from the AAC meeting of September 16, 2010, was provided as follows:

- A delegation was received from Emre Giffin and Karsen Gradidige who provided information and sought the AAC's support for suggested changes to the City's by-law to allow backyard chickens. Currently they keep six bantam hens on acreage in Langley, however they requested that, on behalf of Surrey residents, the City permit up to six chickens in backyards as is allowed in a number of other municipalities. The AAC made some corrections to the information that was presented and made a motion to request that the information be referred to Planning staff to investigate which other municipalities have approved backyard chickens and explore opportunities that Surrey has to allow for backyard chickens.
- Michael McGreer, Economic Development Analyst, Surrey Economic Development Department, briefly discussed the information/marketing brochure being developed that profiles Surrey's Agriculture Sector.
- Don Luymes, Manager, Community Planning Division, Planning and Development, provided information on the Investment Agriculture Grant for Kwantlen Polytechnic University. A letter of support was being sought from the AAC. The AAC expressed concern with the timing of the application not providing enough of an opportunity to research the information. As the study pertains to urban development and looks at underutilized agricultural land, the AAC felt that it would be beneficial to request a delegation from Kwantlen Polytechnic University in order to gain a better understanding of the direction of the work being done and to provide any concerns that the Committee may have in that regard. A delegation is anticipated for the October AAC meeting.
- Preet Heer, Planner, and Markus Kischnick, Planning Technician, Planning & Development Department, noted that Council had asked, at their July meeting, that the Farm Home Plate process be revisited. A background of the work that has been done, to date, was provided. Future work on the Farm Home Plate will be based more on the footprint rather than the house size.

- It was noted that Vaccinium Ovatum should not be an allowable plant for any planting scheme near agricultural land as Vaccinium species can serve as alternate hosts for diseases and pests that affect the species of agricultural importance. As such, in an attempt to control potential pest migration from urban to agricultural areas, the AAC requested that the City of Surrey not use any Vaccinium species in agricultural buffer plantings, or other City directed plantings in or near the ALR.

2. Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Update

An update from the DAC meeting of July 22, 2010, was provided as follows:

- Jeff Arason, Utilities Manager, provided an overview of the 2009 DCC Report, a copy of which is available on the City's website.
- Sheila McKinnon, Manager, Arts, provided a further presentation to the DCC with regard to private sector developer contributions. Comparisons between the City of Richmond and the City of Surrey were illustrated, for which most were consistent, including the developer contribution rate of .5%. A report Council was expected in September with implementation to be in January 2011. An annual review of the program will be undertaken by the Public Art Advisory Committee which will also be reported to Council.
- It was noted that the Sustainability Office is looking at Surrey being solar ready. There was some discussion about taking this proactive approach noting that moving to solar hot water will not be used as an excuse to cut trees – the City's Tree By-law takes precedence.

H. OTHER BUSINESS

1. EAC 2010 Priority Items & Work Plan Stewardship/Stakeholder Groups

The 2010 Priority Items and Work Plan was provided for review and/or update. No additions and/or omissions were given.

2. Data Collection

The question of how the City monitors energy needs and consumption of the transportation sector and how to increase the data base, whether through a pilot project or a voluntary reporting of mileage, was discussed.

The Chair noted that the items to be addressed at the October meeting will include:

- OCP Review Update – to be provided by the Manager, Community Planning Division;
- Sustainable Development Checklist – the Committee to provide feedback and/or requested changes to the information provided by the Manager, Community Planning Division; and
- A review and discussion regarding any potential amendments required or suggested for the Pesticide Control By-law.

I. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be held on October 27, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. in the Executive Board Room.

J. ADJOURNMENT

It was

meeting do now adjourn.

Moved by Councillor Bose
Seconded by G. Sahota
That the Environmental Advisory Committee

Carried

The Environmental Committee adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

Al Schulze, Chair
Surrey Environmental Advisory Committee