

# *Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee - Minutes*

**Present:**

Chair – Councillor Hayne  
B. Campbell  
G. James  
W. Mbaho  
S. Sabharwal  
G. Sahota  
A. Schulze  
D. Skaey  
B. Stewart  
J. Stewart  
S. Van Keulen  
(AFSAC Representative)

**Regrets:**

J. Purewal

**Guests:****Staff Present:**

C. Baron, Manager, Drainage & Environment  
N. Aven, Manager, Urban Forestry &  
Environmental Programs  
A. Mathewson, Manager, Sustainability  
R. Costanzo, Deputy Manager, Engineering  
Operations  
G. Fujii, Manager Building Division, Planning &  
Development  
J. Gallinger, Legislative Services

**A. ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT**

1. Councillor Hayne introduced new Committee Members, William Mbaho and Sarbjit Sabharwal. A round table of introductions ensued.
2. Councillor Hayne called for nominations for appointment as Vice-Chair to the Committee. The following nomination was made – Bob Campbell.

It was Moved by B. Stewart  
Seconded by J. Stewart  
That Bob Campbell be appointed as  
Vice-Chair to the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee for 2014.  
Carried

3. The Chair called for a volunteer to stand as representative on the Agriculture and Food Security Advisory Committee (AFSAC) and another volunteer to stand as representative on the Development Advisory Committee (DAC).

No Committee member volunteered to stand as representative to AFSAC Stan Van Keulen AFSAC representative on ESAC will report to the Committee in the interim and another call for a volunteer will be conducted at the February 26, 2014 ESAC meeting.

Gopal Sahota volunteered to stand as representative to DAC.

It was Moved by B. Stewart  
Seconded by S. Van Keulen  
That Gopal Sahota be appointed as the  
Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee's representative to the  
Development Advisory Committee for 2014.  
Carried

**B. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

It was Moved by B. Campbell  
Seconded by G. James  
That the minutes of the Environmental  
Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held on December 11, 2013 be adopted.  
Carried

**C. DELEGATIONS**

There were no delegations.

**D. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS****1 Building Demolition and Re-Use****DLC Construction Waste Update**

The Acting Operations Manager, Engineering appeared before the Committee to provide and update on DLC Construction Waste. The following comments were made on Building Demolition and Re-Use:

- Surrey allows relocation of structures within its limits.
- Any large structure that is permitted and that has safety provisions in place, are encouraged to relocate within Surrey.
- DLC is moving toward minimization of construction waste and containment of waste is occurring. On the demolition side the DLC requirement is the same.
- Up to 45% Waste was collected in 2013 on residential waste diversion.
- Industrial waste diversion is lower.
- Legislation came down hard on industrial waste diversion.
- Metro Vancouver has a template bylaw for local governments to adopt, which the City has piloted, for developers and demolition companies to abide too. The drafted bylaw will be presented to Council in the second quarter of 2014.
- Issue of transportation of households is allowed within the city – certainly a heritage house – this type of transportation is encouraged.
- Issue of transportation of households from outside of the community is questioned. What is appropriate within a specific community? The house may not fit within the new neighbourhood. Why is the house not remaining in the host city? Local governments vary in bylaws and a house transported to another municipality may not been the areas bylaws.
- Owners are subject to ensuring building codes are met and in the case of moving an older home from one location to another raises safety issues and is of concern to the infrastructure of the area.

- From a waste management view it is a very weak argument on sustainability.
- The Nickels Bros. presentation made to the Committee, in November, included the argument that houses are permitted to be moved into most, if not all, communities around Surrey and the delegate did not understand why Surrey would not allow this kind of movement.
- The issue would be to ensure that the building was a quality structure being moved into the community. It is questioned why Surrey has been singled out and why another City within the lower mainland was not chosen.
- Under the building bylaw movement of buildings within the City are subject to a number of things including compatibility of the home to the new neighbourhood.
- The issue is not one that there is a lot of interest within the community on this topic. The City's Building Department does not get involved with the movement of buildings but provide compliance with Building Codes..
- Vancouver has voluntary deconstructions permits. Permits are not a requirement in Surrey.
- In response to a question regarding the separation of comingled waste staff responded that the issue was being addressed and that a 100% refundable deposit will be required to ensure that the waste management requirements are met developers and/or de-constructors. It has being found that a lot of illegal dumping occurs on new development sites. Developers are responsible for ensuring site security and if a complaint is received regarding waste and if the site is then cleaned up within 24-48 hours the deposit will be returned but if not then a percentage of the deposit will only be returned.
- Staff also noted that due diligence must be followed when reviewing requests for movement of homes into Surrey. If a home is found within the City that requires relocation it can be relocated with no major problems. There have only been 6 applications in the past 14 years and there are exceptions to every rule and each request must be dealt with separately. It was also noted that having to deal with unwanted dwelling (from outside of the City) is not something that the Surrey should have to deal with and is trying to avoid. Dealing with community houses is a priority.
- The Manager, Building Division stated that 400+ demolition permits were issued in 2013 and where the waste material ended up was not known. Educational awareness could be the answer.
- It would be interesting to see any data available regarding the movement of homes versus deconstruction. The statement was made that, if it is possible, a newer home (10 years old or less) should be moved instead of being demolished or deconstructed.

## 2. City Waste Management Initiatives Update

The Deputy Manager, Engineering Operations continued with an update on City Waste Management initiative making the following comments:

Rethink Waste Program

- 2013 was a very successful year. Surrey is one of 22 municipalities that is responsible to adhere to the Solid Waste Plan with a goal of 70% waste recycled by 2015 and an organic waste diversion objective. 65% of garbage in landfill contained food waste. Program structured to divert the food waste being that organic waste placed would be picked up weekly and garbage would be picked up bi-weekly. A 2 year pilot initiated in 2010 (2000 households) was very successful. 50% reduction was seen in the 2 year period. Each household was presented with 3 containers one for food waste, one for recyclables and the last one for garbage. 57 metric tons of organic waste was collected. Objective is to fuel the garbage trucks with a bio waste product. Recycling has increased and garbage has dropped by 43% over previous years. The spotlight is on Surrey by being approached by other cities and municipalities in regards to the City's success in waste management and how it was used to reduce garbage.
- There was a challenge with organic waste. The City's processor, in Richmond, complained that there was too much contamination within the waste. On investigation, it was noted that the contamination was due to the misdirection of 3 garbage trucks. In early 2013 4.2% of the organic waste was found to be contaminated. This created a burden on the processors to remove the contamination (ie. plastic bags). Students were hired and dealt with the contamination problem by notifying those contaminating the recycling and shortly thereafter record levels of waste diversion was noticed and numbers went down to 0.7%.
- Prices at the processing sites vary on what waste is brought in.

#### Biofuel facility procurement project

- The Federal Government will provide 25% of the capital cost of the proposed recycling facility in Port Kells. The property is adjacent to the transfer station and the facility will have a 25 year lease period for an 85,000 metric ton per year facility. The facility will be able to handle projected increases in household growth waste tonnage.
- Gas will be produced as well as nutrient compost and fertilizer.
- 11 proposals were received for the facility. The technology is not new, but there are many companies that are trying to get a foothold in Canada. 3 organizations have been shortlisted through due diligence and the Request for Proposal (RFP) process will be in February with the facility ready for processing by 2016.

#### Surrey Residential Drop Off (RDO)

- Surrey's regional facility was a project with Metro Vancouver now the goal is to have one facility in Metro Vancouver and one facility in Surrey by the end of 2016. Sites cannot be disclosed at this point in time.
- The facility will be going back to being called an Eco Centre. The operating side may be the only portion that Surrey will have to pay for.
- Metro Vancouver WTE Process material is currently transported to Cache Creek and/or the Burnaby was facility. A new facility is to be built within the region. It is a very long 8 step process – currently in step 2. The next step will see the marrying of sites to the proponents and construction should begin in 2017. This is a very controversial process.

- Facility space is available for the Metro Vancouver facility in the Newton area but the owner is requesting too much compensation and another is available in South Surrey.
- Are any of the sites in Surrey? It is not known if a private owner has come forth. Metro Vancouver has stated that the sites would be confidential.
- How large is the site – 10 acres is an approximately.
- Public feedback will be required for Metro Vancouver to narrow down the sites.
- Waste energy is burning garbage and the end product will be used for heat exchange, electricity etc. A wet or dry facility will be the only types of facilities permitted in Surrey. Thermal waste facilities are the types of facilities that cause problems and there is currently a split debate on how effective chemical separation is.

The following comments were made:

- In regards to mechanical separation stations, staff responded that it would not be profitable to migrate to mechanical separation stations if all combustible debris was removed. The mechanical separation stations in Europe transfer the end product to heat or electrical.
- Staff advised that when a resident is not recycling they are advised and warned of potential fines when discovered. An analysis of those not recycling was performed in 2010 and is being revisited.
- Staff stated that organic waste diversion, for multi-unit developments, is the next step for the City. Single family recycling monitoring is easy as a contamination notice can be put on the recycling bin but it is difficult to do so in multi-unit developments.

Multi-unit organic waste diversion is just starting in the City and it has been suggested that Strata Corporations be held responsible for contamination.

#### Multi-Material BC (MMBC)

- In May 2011 the Ministry of the Environment adopted a recycling regulation change shifting the cost of recycling to producers and focusing on blue boxes The City embraced this change.
- MMBC was created by Producers and created a Stewardship Plan. The Stewardship Plan is a high level plan detailing how waste was going to be dealt with.

MMBC Options were:

1. MMBC recycles and pays local governments;
  2. Local governments take care of own waste; or
  3. reject the plan continue to be taxed for waste management.
- Timeframe:
    - April 13, 2013 30 day period to contest plan.
    - June 2013 MMBC submits 2 agreements that monetarily did not cover collection costs in most municipalities. These agreements

- were not a sound analysis on municipal costs for recycling. This type of agreement showed that the municipalities would be receiving funds for recycling but would also be incurring fines should minimal contamination percentages not be met.
- September 16, 2013 was the mandatory response deadline unilaterally imposed by MMBC. The dilemma faced by local governments was that it was a risk not to participate. Many municipalities stated their displeasure but many agreements were made.
  - November 30, 2013 was the mandatory Agreement. Three issues required resolutions prior to signing the Agreement:
    1. There was no mutual termination clause. Only MMBC was allowed to terminate.
    2. A change of law was required with each local government responsible to make the required change; and
    3. There were no caps on fines.
  - The Agreement issues were resolved and fines were capped at \$122,000.
  - Most municipalities accepted the financial offer but Langley Township and Delta opted out.
  - Key unresolved issues the City has with the agreement are that Council has no say in MMBC recycling process. MMBC is responsible for governance in Option 1. Recycling of glass – beverage bottles are fine to recycle but jars need to be recycled separately. The City is now looking at this issue legally to have the agreement reviewed to confirm that all glass can be put into the carts as the City is below 3% Contamination. It is important to note that glass is a loss leader and chards of glass can get into other recyclables and contaminate.
  - The MMBC Program Commences on May 19, 2014.

The Chair thanked staff for the presentation and commended the work on waste management to date.

The following comments were made:

- Regarding transfer stations, the Deputy Manager stated that transfer stations were clean up stations where the separation of garbage, recyclables, organics occurred.
- Staff stated that there would be an increase in recycling in the scope of what materials will not be recycled through MMBC with the switch of services. MMBC wants to high grade their material which is why they do not want to accept glass.
- The reality is that MMBC and the other producers get the economic benefits not the local governments. At the end of the day, the less material you put out, the less you have to recycle. The goal is to have only one type of packaging.
- It was noted that there was a lot of bureaucracy around waste management and concern was shown around costs runaway and MMBC having sole control.

- Staff stated that the Ministry of Environment was responsible for Product Stewardship Canada and that the Board Chair was VP, Legal & External Affairs and General Counsel Unilever Canada Inc.
- Those designing the program have projections of what recycling will be collected so they know how much money will be paid out. The purpose of the program is not to have to pay for recycling. The producers pay MMBC so that MMBC can pay local governments.
- Regarding revenue collected by the City the Deputy Manager responded that Surrey was close to having 90% of the cost being covered which is being passed down to the taxpayer. A net increase will not be seen but a slight decrease should be noticed.
- It was not known how often payment was received from MMBC?
- Of note is the fact that MMBC cannot change their mind on what the payment to the City is as payment is calculated by formula. The Deputy Manager confirmed that the City may cancel the contract at any point.
- In response to how confident he was that the City is ready for the start date the delegate responded that residents won't even notice the difference as the City already has this type of collection. MMBC is taking over for the previous collection system.

#### **Intervener Status re: Kinder/Morgan Project (Fortis BC)**

Manager, Drainage & Environment updated the Committee on the proposed Kinder/Morgan (Fortis BC) and stated the city is not really involved in the project.

- A new proposal is to divert away from residential areas more towards the highway – staff is researching this at this time.
- The Committee was questioned as to whether or not the intervener status was required and was informed that Surrey can actively participate at the table and that there may be an opportunity to participate with other municipalities regarding the Project. It was noted that from an environmental perspective there was no negativity in applying for the status and that the Committee could deal with delegations opposed/for the project. At this point it was good to leave the options open.

Kinder/Morgan to be invited to attend a future ESAC meeting.

### **3. Work Plan 2014**

#### **1. Climate and Energy Issues**

- EnergyShift/Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP)
- Continued updates from staff

#### **2. Solid Waste Management**

- Monitor the Solid Waste contract, especially multi-family project
- On-going updates from the Deputy Operations Manager

3. **Neighbourhood Community Plan reviews**
  - Active involvement in review of the NCP's
  - Sensitive Urban Infill Study
  - Invite delegations from UBC and staff to provide overview of the study
4. **Monitor status of selected environmental projects:**
  - Review Tree Bylaw
5. **Current Environmental Issues**
6. **Miscellaneous**
  - Biodiversity Conservation Strategy to be kept on radar but not part of 2014 Plan.
  - Update sustainability charter – major overhaul.
  - South Fraser perimeter road – wildlife corridors

Work Plan 2014 was left open and tabled to the February 26, 2013 ESAC Meeting.

#### **E. NEW BUSINESS**

The Committee discussed what happens to trees (in particular mature trees) when development occurs on a parcel that will be subdivided.

- It was noted that developers provide estimations of where utilities and houses will be built. On review of these estimations the City negotiates with the developer to establish which trees can be removed and then a restrictive covenant is put on the remaining trees. Subsequently, when the buyer purchases property there is a process the buyer may pursue to remove additional trees to accommodate the construction of the dwelling.
- Staff noted that Planning and bylaws are aware of the problem and agree. The trees that are required to be cut down for utility purposes, by the developer, remain on the property and are put under restrictive covenant until a purchaser has chosen a site for the home. Once the site is chosen the buyer may then request permission for additional trees to be removed. The argument is that the first cut allowance should not be allowed.
- It is made clear before the PLA that the remaining trees cannot be cut. The point in doing the cut at the first stage is that it is more convenient for purchaser to have someone else cut the trees down and not pay for it. Planning will be invited to a meeting to clarify the issue and to discuss how fines are imposed and what the fines are.
- The Tree Protection Bylaw 16100 to be reviewed at the February 26, 2014 meeting.

#### **F. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL**

There were no items referred by Council

**G. CORRESPONDENCE**

1. Email dated December 31, 2013 to Lily Grewal, President, North Delta NDP Executive re: Proposed Surrey Fraser Docks Coal Transfer Facility
2. Letter dated December 17, 2013 to Mayor Watts and Council re: support of the Independent Interagency Review Committee and corresponding copies of letters to Port Metro Vancouver on the Proposed Surrey Fraser Docks Coal Transfer Facility

It was

Moved by B. Campbell

Seconded by G. James

That the above-mentioned correspondence

be received..

Carried

**H. INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. **Agriculture and Food Security Advisory Committee (AFSAC) Update from January 9, 2014 meeting:**  
There was nothing to report.
2. **Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Update from the January 23, 2014 meeting**  
There was nothing to report.

**I. OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

**J. NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee will be held on Wednesday, February 26, 2014, location to be determined.

**K. ADJOURNMENT**

It was

Moved by G. Sahota

Seconded by J. Stewart

That the Environmental Sustainability Advisory

Committee meeting adjourn.

Carried

The Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee adjourned at 8:52 pm.

---

Jane Sullivan, City Clerk

---

Councillor Hayne, Chair