

Environmental Sustainability Advisory **Committee - Minutes** 

Location: Virtual Wednesday, June 24, 2020 Time: 6:00 p.m.

Present:	<u>Regrets:</u>	Staff Present:
Councillor Pettigrew, Chair	J. Werring	C. Stewart, Senior Planner
B. Campbell, Vice-Chair		M. Osler, Senior Project Engineer
J. Dhami		N. Aven, Manager, Parks
K. Purton		N. Chan, Manager, Trees & Landscape
L. Walker		P. Zevit, BCS Planner
M. Lamont		R. Landucci, Manager, Urban Forestry
M. Sharma		S. Godwin, Manager, Environment
N. Hogan		Y. Yohannes, Manager, Utilities
P. Mann		C. Eagles, Administrative Assistant
S. Rush		-
S. VanKeulen		

### **ADOPTIONS** A.

#### Adoption of the Agenda 1.

It was

Moved by K. Purton Seconded by J. Dhami That the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee adopt the agenda, as amended by adding:

> C.2 5G Sub-Committee; and

**Delegation Request - Port Authority** H.2

Carried

### **Adoption of the Minutes** 2.

It was

Moved by B. Campbell Seconded by N. Hogan That the minutes of the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held Minutes of May 27, 2020. be adopted as presented.

Carried

### B. **STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

**CFAS Implementation and the Environmental Assessment Approval Process** 1. Matt Osler, Senior Project Engineer

Staff provided a presentation on the Coastal Flood Adaptation Strategy Implementation and highlighted the following information:

- In 2016, the process began to determine how to reduce climate changedriven coastal flood risks presently and into the future. A range of strategic actions were developed to help the City's coastal communities become more resilient to challenges. Council endorsed a final strategy on November 4, 2019 through Corporate Report No. R212.
- In the early stages of engagement, stakeholders raised concerns that there were information gaps about coastal ecosystems. The City obtained a \$171,400 grant in 2017 from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to conduct a study to assess ecosystem and infrastructure risks in Surrey's coastal flood areas.
- The study was called The Mud Bay Ecosystem and Infrastructure Risk Prioritization (PIER) project which began in August 2017 and was recently completed. Staff provided an overview of the deliverables of the project and highlighted the online Story Map, Mud Bay – Surrey, BC, Ecosystem at Risk.
- The City also received 76.6 million in federal funding awarded under the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund (DMAF) to implement priority actions developed in the Coastal Flood Adaptation Strategy.
- Environmental outcomes include the Community Energy Association's inaugural Climate Adaptation Award and the City was selected as a municipal example of Sustainable Development.
- Mud Bay Foreshore Enhancements include protection along 1 km of Mud Bay Park, developing a nature-based solution for reducing coastal squeeze and coastal flooding, establishing a salt marsh habitat over a wider distance and preserving the natural look of the shore line while keeping the ability to adapt to sea level rise.
- Staff are seeking input and endorsement from the Committee on the Mud Bay Foreshore Enhancements. It was noted consultation and stakeholder engagement will be on-going and updates to Council on the overall CFAS implementation will be provided.

Related to the Coastal Flood Adaptation Strategy Strategic Direction for Mud Bay, the Committee expressed concerns regarding the potential loss of 1000 acres of farmland and whether it can be replaced. Staff clarified that multiple lines of defence are required to reduce long term flood risk and that none of the projects part of DMAF will result in loss of farmland. Committee member inquired whether Semiahmoo First Nation (SFN) was supportive of the Mud Bay Foreshore. Staff commented that SFN has been engaged in the process and supports the foreshore project and has one element of DMAF occurring on SFN lands that they will be delivering.

In response to a question from the Committee, staff clarified that none of the projects trigger a Federal Environmental Assessment, with the exception of the DMAF element occurring on SFN lands that has yet to be confirmed by the Federal government if an environmental assessment is required . Staff noted the DMAF projects help protect properties throughout the floodplain by adapting critical infrastructure to climate change and sea level rise. A member noted there is a large amount of waterfowl occupying some of the lands.

t was	Moved by B. Campbell
	Seconded by P. Mann
	That the Environmental Sustainability
Advisory Committee receive	the PIER Project Presentation as information.
	<u>Carried</u>

It was

Moved by L. Walker Seconded by K. Purton That the Environmental Sustainability

Advisory Committee endorse the proposed Foreshore Enhancements in Mud Bay Park as presented.

**Carried** 

B. Campbell expressed concerns on endorsing projects with a lack of information. Another member clarified that staff provided previous presentations on the subject matter.

Staff noted there will be a public consultation period in November 2020 to March 2021.

# C. NEW BUSINESS

# 1. Green City Program Update

Neal Aven, Manager of Parks

- Staff provided an update on the Green City Program and highlighted the following information:
- Conceived in the summer of 2005, the Green City Program is a sustainable tree planting and tree management program intended to provide additional emphasis on augmenting the City's tree inventory.
- Funding is received through 2% of building permit revenues, cash in lieu of replacements trees and tree removal penalties as part of the Tree Protection Bylaw.
- The Program includes tree planting on arterial and collector roads, tree planting on residential local roads, tree planting in parks, forest restoration, tree hazard management adjacent to development sites, community tree plantings and events.
- The 2020 Green City Program budget is approximately \$1.5 million dollars.

- The balance of the Green City Program Fund as of December 31, 2019 is \$11,759,000.
- Staff noted the Green City Program is not in a statutory reserve nor was it established by bylaw. Staff encourage residents to connect with Parks to look at tree planting initiatives.

In response to a question, staff clarified the City Beautification Program and Green City Program are different. Staff noted the three pillars of sustainability – sociocultural, environmental and economic and there is an Ecosystem Theme within the overlapping Community Themes of the Sustainability Charter 2.0.

The Chair requested that staff provide all Corporate Report links related to the Green City Program to the Committee. Staff clarified that a bylaw is necessary to establish a reserve fund.

The Chair would like to see a report on current Council plans to take funds from the Green City Program and the status of the Reserve Fund. The Chair questioned whether the City has the right take funds out of the Green City Program as it related to Section 189 of the Community Charter.

In response to the Chair's question, a member of the committee recommended that the Chair discuss with staff and provide information back to the Committee.

# 2. 5G Sub-Committee

L. Walker noted there are eight members attending and would like to present to the Committee at the upcoming ESAC meeting. L. Walker asked what the current knowledge of ESAC is and any recommendations on what to present on.

Members noted that it may be a health and safety topic and not an environmental issue. L. Walker clarified that after the sub-committee 5G fact-finding mission she wanted to present to ESAC on the potential effects of 5G on the environment.

# D. OUTSTANDING BUSINESS

# 1. Tree Protection Bylaw Discussion

The Committee discussed previous discussion on the need to acknowledge the ecological services of trees and to appropriately compensate for their loss through development related land-development and discussed the potential to direct staff to amend the Tree Protection Bylaw to create Bylaw tree, size-classes based upon ascending diameter sizes including:

- 30-50 cm dbh
- 50-80 cm dbh
- 80+ cm dbh; and

And to proportionally increase the amount of replacement trees required based upon these ascending size-classes including:

- 30-50 cm dbh = 2.1 replacement
- 50-80 cm dbh = 5:1 replacement
- 80+ cm dbh = 10.1 replacement

Staff clarified that some municipalities are looking into doing similar size scaling requirements, but it is not common yet. Members would like to differentiate between life expectancy and the value of the trees as some coniferous trees last centuries while some deciduous tress last less than 100 years. It was noted there was previous discussion of having a tree in the City atrium that displays the benefits of trees through public education such as; improved air quality, storm water management, climate change resilience, public health benefits etc. Staff will provide an update on this initiative at an upcoming meeting.

The Committee would like to keep ecological services calculations simple. A member noted that incentives for residents and the development community to keep trees would be beneficial.

The Committee noted the following comments: development process results in the highest tree loss; educational component is important in how the community views trees and tree loss, how development and planning process removes trees; clear cutting lands with no intentions of tree replacement; building design and placement to allow for further retention of trees; understanding development application process; land rights; and why densities occur where they do.

The Chair requested that staff from planning provide a presentation on tree replacement and retention within development proposals.

Staff clarified there are differences between the zoning bylaw and tree bylaw. It was noted that development rights precede the Tree Protection Bylaw within the Local Government Act. Council is able to ask for further tree retention within rezoning applications. Other factors include building design and a Municipality's legal rights.

2. Biodiversity Conservation Funding Update Stephen Godwin, Environment Manager

Item D.2 was deferred to the next ESAC Meeting.

# E. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

This section has no items to consider.

### F. CORRESPONDENCE

This section has no items to consider.

### G. **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### Agriculture and Food Policy Advisory Committee (AFPAC) Update 1.

At the June 2, 2020 AFPAC meeting, AFPAC endorsed the CFAS Project. It was noted an application moved forward to the ALC which was not endorsed by AFPAC.

### H. **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Verbal Updates** 1.

There were no verbal updates.

### **Delegation Request - Vancouver Port Authority, Environmental Issues** 2.

It was

Moved by Councillor Pettigrew Seconded by S. VanKeulen That the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee support the delegation request from the Vancouver Port Authority.

Carried

### I. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee will be held on July 29, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

### **ADJOURNMENT** J.

It was

Moved by B. Campbell Seconded by S. VanKeulen That the Environmental Sustainability

Advisory Committee adjourn.

Carried

The Environmental Sustainability Advisory Committee adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Jennifer Ficocelli, City Clerk

Councillor Steven Pettigrew, Chair