

**Present:**

A. Schulze - Chair  
B. Burnside  
B. Campbell  
C. Dragomir  
J. Purewal  
B. Stewart  
Councillor Bose  
S. VanKeulen, Agricultural  
Advisory Committee  
Representative

**Regrets:**

M. Harcourt  
K. Keshvani  
G. Sangha  
G. Sahota

**Staff Present:**

C. Baron, Drainage and Environment Mgr.  
L. Luaifofo, Legislative Services  
T. Neufeld, Manager, Park Operations South

**Guests:**

Margaret Cuthbert	Ron Meadley
Paul Griffin	Phillip Milligan
Christy Juteau	David Riley
Deb Jack	

**A. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by Constantin Dragomir  
Seconded by Stan Van Keulen  
That the minutes of the Environmental  
Advisory Committee meeting held on September 28, 2011, be adopted as amended.  
Carried

**B. DELEGATIONS**

- Semiahmoo Fish & Game Club, Little Campbell Watershed Society, A Rocha Canada, Friends of Semiahmoo Bay & Surrey Environmental Partners**  
File No. 5360-60

Re: Concerns with Land Fill Permit at 16 Avenue & 194th Street

Ron Meadley provided a presentation on behalf of the Semiahmoo Fish & Game Club/Little Campbell Hatchery, Semiahmoo First Nation, A Rocha Canada, Little Campbell River Watershed Society, Friends of Semiahmoo Bay Society, Surrey Environmental Partners and residential neighbours adjacent to site.

Concerns and risks with Permit Application (19356 16th Avenue, 787627 B.C. Ltd.) were outlined and Little Campbell River (Tat-a-la) was noted as being at a high risk of being compromised. Over the past 55 years, community members have been dedicated to restoration and enhancement of Little Campbell River and tributaries.

The site is 37 acres of agricultural pasture sloping down to Little Campbell River at 16th Avenue & 194th Street and is bordered on north & west by Little Campbell River. It is classified as A1 and has had unlicensed gravel extraction in 1960's &

1970's. The proposal is a permit to dump 330,000 cubic metres of structural fill – predominately clay (80%) over a 10 year period, to a depth of 8 metres within 30 metres of Little Campbell River.

Concerns with the application were outlined as follows:

- Unorthodox & unprecedented approach to landfill due to open ended topography of the location
- Proximity to the river – inadequate margin of safety
- Unproven & questionable approach to drainage, erosion & sediment control – no reference sites
- Recent history of poorly designed or implemented engineering approaches to sediment control in the watershed
- Duration of risk
- Inadequate approaches to monitoring (reaction time), maintenance and enforcement
- Approval would significantly "lower the bar" for future permit applications within the watershed
- Traffic congestion and safety
- The delegation stated that the risks to the environment and the safety of the public of a fill site at this location are too great. If there is a growing demand for this addition fill capacity we suggest that the City consider more suitable locations.

The Committee ensued discussion and made the following comments:

- The fill site should be monitored during filling and also post filling. Any future building(s) put on this site, near the slope would require special precautions to be taken.
- Where is the application in the process of acquiring the permit?  
*Council has looked at the concerns, recognized the dangers and asked staff to look if there are alternative sites. Prior to the spring of this year, there was no policy that mandated public hearings. Council has since adopted a soil policy which would require approval from Council for over 35,000 cubic metres of deposition. Sites with over 10,000 cubic metres would be required to post signage on the site.*
- Public hearings provide a basis for Council's approval of applications. If Council supports this application, the owner/operator would be expected to work closely with the engineering department and staff.
- It was questioned if the City was able to shut a site down if there is non-compliance?  
*Yes, the City has the authority to shut down sites that are non compliant*
- The current Federal & Provincial setback regulation is 30 metres.
- Previous fill sites have been approved to build up the land for agriculture. There are no apparent valid reasons to bring fill into this site.
- The City does not own any land around Little Campbell River. If the City acquired land beyond the 30 metres, it would be expensive per acre.
- It was questioned if it was possible to insist that Department of Fisheries and Oceans increase the setback from 30 metres.

*DFO cannot increase the setback more than 30 metres and would intervene if the river was to be impacted negatively.*

- It was questioned if an independent consultant been utilized.  
*An independent consultant has looked at the project and identified concerns. The legal point of view is unknown.*
- Staff will notify the Committee if the application goes to a public hearing.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

It was

Moved by B.Campbell

Seconded by Councillor Bose

That the Environmental Advisory Committee

has received a comprehensive presentation on the Proposed Land Fill Site at 194 Street and 16 Avenue and have discussed the issue. The Committee cannot see how this project can proceed without unacceptable and extensive environmental risks to Little Campbell River and the Committee recommends to Council to not approve the permit application.

Carried

### C. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

#### 1. Community Gardens In Surrey

The Manager, Park Operations South was present to answer questions re: community gardens.

- The importance of community gardens and the need to get the ball going on this initiative was expressed. Community gardens benefit parks, enable people to interact with the community, enrich the environment and improve neighbourhoods.
- It would be beneficial to hear the value of community gardens from the Parks and Recreation perspective. It may also be beneficial to research the background literature in North America on the value of community gardens and best practices.
- Identifying ideal sites is important when developing gardens in the City. A good location (site) is determined based on demographics, density and bus routes. Staff has researched a dozen potential sites in the City for community gardens.
- A challenge with community gardens has been engaging the community. People are interested in gardening, but not to be responsible for the organization of the gardens. Staff would like to build community capacity then develop the gardens. A key ingredient to community gardens is to have organizers take responsibility and then the gardens become more self sustainable.
- Possible groups that may want to be involved with organizing community gardens are community associations (culturally, faith or service based).

- A mini conference or forum with key note speakers from Seattle, Portland or other nearby cities was suggested. These cities would share their knowledge and models of their community gardens.
- Having schools participate is an interest for the City. Schools are out in the summer time during the most popular time for gardening. Princess Margaret is a school that expressed an interest in community gardens.
- It was suggested that Parks & Recreation work collaboratively with other committees such as the Social Planning Advisory Committee and the Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee.
- There are people who will rise to the occasion to assist with the organization of community gardens because of their passion for gardening.
- If there are pieces of land sitting idle, the City may consider advertising for interested people who want to take part in organizing community gardens.

The Committee provided the following direction to Manager, Park Operations South:

1. Relay the discussion of the Committee re: community gardens to the Manager, Parks Division and to discuss the possibility of providing the EAC a presentation of the City's model for community gardens.
2. Generate a list of potential delegates that could contribute to community gardens and bring back to the EAC.
3. Look at the models of other municipalities and what their successes are and how Councils and townships have made community gardens work.

## 2. **Solid Waste Recycling**

Due to confidentiality of the RFP process, the Deputy Operations Manager was not in attendance to speak to Solid Waste Recycling and the RFP.

The Committee discussed the RFP and the following comments were provided:

- The RFP contract has not yet been awarded; therefore, this is the time when the City can request bidders to be creative and also to provide bidders a sense of what the City targets are, for example, newsprint and how it is sorted to the extent that it goes to the highest and best value for newspaper.
- The current contract will solicit the lowest bid but not necessarily the bid that does the very best job.
- It is proprietary to question where the materials are being shipped too once they have been collected.
- Product stewardship is very important and should be a priority.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

It was

Moved by B. Campbell  
Seconded by J. Purewal  
That the Environmental

Advisory Committee:

- believes that recyclable materials that the citizens of Surrey place in their blue boxes should be processed in a manner that minimizes residues or garbage and that sorts these recyclables such that contamination levels for each product stream meets or exceeds the commercial standard for the best and highest use of the respective material.
- are concerned that the City of Surrey has created a Request For Proposal (RFP) document that will not necessary result in the above behavior. This RFP is targeted at companies interesting in supplying the collection services, but also requires the successful collection contractor to contract directly with a sorting entity and, based on our understanding of the current RFP document:
  1. Does not request any mandatory, periodic reporting of residuals or contamination. This information is only to be made available upon request.
  2. Does not provide any targets for residuals or contamination for the various product streams. (these targets are well understood and available from the purchasers of these materials)
  3. Uses the very soft "commercially reasonable" contract language as the defined level of effort. Once the contract is awarded, and with no specified residual and contamination targets, it will be very easy for any contractor to claim it is not "commercially reasonable" to achieve high levels of performance with the remuneration specified by the contract.
  4. The RFP leaves the selection of the sorting entity to the successful collection contractor. Obviously, the collection contractor, having won the collection RFP, will attempt to maximize his profit by minimizing the cost of the sorting entity.
  5. It is not clear if the performance parameters of the collection/sorting contracts including the final destination and purchasers of each product stream, the amount of residue and contamination for each stream will be public information.
  6. The RFP does require bidders to include the cost of collecting recyclables with CNG powered trucks. This would represent a significant cost to any bidder who does not current own a CNG fleet. The environmental benefits of CNG versus conventional diesel are minimal and the same benefits versus "clean diesel" are even smaller. It is an admirable objective to reduce diesel emissions, but the cost benefits of this reduction would be very high versus the cost benefit and environmental gains of applying these funds to the more efficient recycling of thousands of tons of recyclable materials.

The EAC believes that the RFP should encourage creative bids that provide outstanding performance at the lowest possible costs. If the RFP does not provide bidding guidelines as detailed above, we are concerned that it will merely encourage bids with the lowest cost. Finally, the RFP should be consistent to terms and objectives of the Sustainable Charter, Section 3, EN2: Waste Reduction.

Carried

**D. NEW BUSINESS****1. Pesticide Use**

A community member reported that a local company had been using pesticides for cosmetic use and using the reason of "infestation". The community member was recommended to send a letter to the EAC Committee re: the Pesticide By-law and the loop hole with the definition of "infestation".

**2. Delegation Request**

Ron Meadley e-mail re: Proposed Gas Station at 1598-184 Street

It was  
attend the November 23, 2011 EAC meeting re: Proposed Gas Station at 1598-184 be accepted.

Moved by Councillor Bose  
Seconded by B. Campbell

That the Ron Meadley delegation request to

Carried

**E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL****F. CORRESPONDENCE****G. INFORMATION ITEMS****1. Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) Update****2. Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Update****3. Anniedale-Tynehead – Stage 2 Neighbourhood Concept Plan**

Committee members attended the land use concept open house on October 5<sup>th</sup> in Cloverdale. There were approximately 200 people in attendance, most of whom appeared to be developers.

The presentation largely dealt with infrastructure requirements, which present a huge problem. No water feeder or sanitary sewer mains exist, and the roads are quite inadequate and would have to be greatly expanded. There are no plans for additional access to Highway 1 or Golden Ears Way, and there is no transit in the area.

The maps do not indicate how much of the existing high value vegetation and wetlands will be lost.

**H. OTHER BUSINESS**

**I. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Environmental Advisory Committee will be held on November 23, in the Executive Boardroom at 6:30pm.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

Moved by Councillor Bose

Seconded by S. Van Keulen

That the Environmental Advisory Committee

meeting do now adjourn.

Carried

The Environmental Committee adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Al Schulze, Chair

Surrey Environmental Advisory Committee