

TOWN OF CANMORE
MINUTES
Environmental Advisory Review Committee
Room 212 Elevation Place
5pm, Monday March 9, 2020

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Raina	Chair (via phone)
Karena Thieme	Vice Chair
Sari Ohsada	Public Member
Dominique Lagloire-Galipeau	Public Member
Ralph Walicki	Public Member
Richard Daniel	Public Member
Julie Ulan	Public Member
Cheryl Hojnowski	Biosphere Institute of the Bow Valley Liaison

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Councillor Esme Comfort	Council Representative
-------------------------	------------------------

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT

Lori Rissling Wynn	Town of Canmore Liaison, Sustainability Coordinator
Amy Fournier	Town of Canmore, minute recorder, Climate Change Specialist

Action items in red.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- Meeting called to order by K. Thieme at 5:14 pm.
- No additions to the agenda

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes from January 6, 2020 meeting had been sent to EARC members and approved via email.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- No unfinished business.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. TSMV ASP and EIS process and provincial wildlife corridor decision

- L. Rissling Wynn had provided [background information](#) about the Three Sisters Mountain Village (TSMV) and [Provincial Wildlife Corridor decision](#) prior to the meeting and asked if members had a chance to review. She then went over the process for the ASP (Area Structure Plan) and EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) and identified how they relate to each other and showed a flow chart (attached) outlining the two concurrent processes. She also outlined how EARC's comments are provided to both Council and the applicant via the EIS. She indicated this is complicated in this instance because of the additional decision by the Province on the wildlife corridor. The timing of the decision by the Province came as a surprise to Council and to staff, and that timing somewhat explains why the Applicant requested to postpone the EARC review of the EIS.

- There has been some discussion regarding changing the scope of EIS reviews in the EARC TOR, however that issue would have to be addressed at a later date. The current “rules of engagement” for EARC review of EIS will stand for review of these EISs. Any changes to EARC’s TOR would require Council approval.
- C. Hojnowski asked if there is any chance the wildlife corridor decision can be changed due to public input? L. Rissling Wynn responded that her impression from the Province’s presentation at Council is that this decision is final.
- R. Daniels noted that his impression was that the boundaries are firm but the public would be able to provide comment on how the lands adjacent to the corridor are planned as part of the ASP process.
- K. Thieme asked if it was expected that there will be any changes to the EIS. L. Rissling Wynn responded that it makes sense that the Applicant would make changes based on the wildlife corridor decision.
- B. Raina asked if there are changes to the boundaries from the original EIS that was withdrawn. L. Rissling Wynn responded that the [TSMV proposal by Golder](#) available on our website has the map and this has not changed from the provincial decision. The specific area of interest is by Smith Creek.
- C. Hojnowski stated that the original NRCB decision required that TSMV do a resort and recreation development. What happens if we don’t get that from the Applicant? What criteria does the Town of Canmore use to decide if the application meets that requirement adequately? L. Rissling Wynn replied that the draft ASP that we have seen has elements of a resort centre and that they have to stay within the existing settlement agreement and existing land-use zoning for the number of units that can be built.
- B. Raina commented that he had read the EIS and ASP before the review was postponed and to him it seems as if they are trying to do a Whistler or Mt. Tremblant style resort development.
- K. Thieme asked because it is so far from downtown and the rest of Canmore, how much is public transit and other services the responsibility of the Town versus the developer? L. Rissling replied that Engineering will be looking at this in concept at the ASP stage and later in more detail at the subdivision level. Members of the public can provide input at the Public Hearing for the ASP. EARC members could also choose to attend, as members of the community, and either share their thoughts at the meeting or as a written submission.
- C. Hojnowski asked if the Town will be evaluating the ASP proposal in the context of our climate goals and whether public input will actually matter. L. Rissling Wynn responded that the previous submission by Price Waterhouse Coopers was influenced by public input. She clarified the process at Public Hearings is that Council invites a speaker who is supportive of the motion or issue, followed by someone who is against, followed by neutral comments. They continue to alternate in this manner until all of the speakers have been heard. She feels that based on what has happened in the past that the process will be fairly robust. Between the 2nd and 3rd reading the Applicant can choose to update the plan to address feedback. With our climate goals, we can ask the file manager for the TSMV project how GHGs considerations will be included in the Council Report.
- R. Daniels shared that the Bow Valley Climate Action group looked at whether ASPs are an effective tool for GHG considerations. They felt that it is a bit high level and having requirements in the Land Use Bylaw is a more effective tool. It is difficult to get firm commitments at the ASP level.
- S. Ohsada asked for clarification on the difference between EARC members providing individual input on the EIS and input at the public hearing. L. Rissling Wynn replied that when the EARC review of the EIS goes forward, it is the submission from the Committee. EARC’s scope is also limited to determining whether the EIS meets the Terms of Reference. If EARC members have thoughts to share beyond that scope, they can participate as individuals at the Public Hearing.
- R. Daniels asked if there were any guesses on timing of the EIS being resubmitted. L. Rissling Wynn responded that she couldn’t guess, especially considering that the EIS review had been postponed.

- C. Hojnowski stated that she had heard that the legal process will take 2 years but the ASP process will continue concurrent to that. There are still questions about who will own the wildlife fence and maintain it. L. Rissling Wynn said that some of these questions will be posed during the ASP process but is not sure of the kinds of specific details that will be sorted out.
- B. Raina stated that his impression was that the Town prefers to own the fence.
- C. Hojnowski voiced concern about questions about enforcement and that if these and other questions that are important aren't answered sufficiently, how it will impact Council's decision. L. Rissling Wynn responded that Council will consider this on a balance with multiple aspects that they have to juggle and that the final decision will be a vote.
- J. Ulan asked what the process is if Council votes down the ASP. L. Rissling Wynn responded that they would have to come back with a new application.
- R. Daniels commented that he feels that the Province is trying to keep a clear and firm separation between the Corridor and the ASP. They have set the boundary for the wildlife corridor and that the expectation is that the Town's role is to decide what happens within the areas outside of the corridor through the ASP.

2. 2018 GHG Inventory

- A. Fournier provided the presentation of the 2018 GHG Inventory that was delivered at the February 18th, 2020 Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting. This presentation had been given to Council as Information Only, as is the case at all COW meetings. The PPT slides are attached.
- C. Hojnowski asked if we are going to set new targets in line with science and the updated Federal targets (50% reduction by 2030 and net zero by 2050). L. Rissling Wynn responded that likely not and that it is going to be difficult to achieve the existing 30% reduction target. C. Hojnowski asked if there was value in demonstrating that municipalities can't do it on their own and letting people know that even 30% will not be enough.
- K. Thieme asked if we had seen energy savings from the pool being closed in January and February and wondered if there would be value in doing the annual maintenance closure in the winter months instead of September.
- D. Lagloire-Galipeau asked if the GHG Inventory Tool that we used for the 2018 Inventory was available to businesses to use. A. Fournier replied that it is just available to municipalities in the Federation of Municipalities (FCM) Partners for Climate Protection (PCP) program. L. Rissling Wynn said that we have been considering the idea of setting up a local business leadership network similar to [Edmonton's Corporate Climate Leaders](#) program and asked if that would be of interest. D. Lagloire-Galipeau responded that yes it would be and that they had an organization help them in this area previously but are interested in doing more work on energy use and GHGs. C. Hojnowski asked what is stopping us from doing a program like this. L. Rissling Wynn responded that it is time and budget. Edmonton pays a significant portion to have [Climate Smart](#) work with individual businesses, beyond the small fee that businesses pay directly, and staff time is required above this for recruitment and coordination. K. Thieme asked if you could link business taxes to GHG emissions.

3. Solar Incentive

- L. Rissling Wynn reported that we had four applications for the Town of Canmore solar incentive. Eight incentives of \$1,250 were available, therefore all four applicants will receive an incentive. As the \$10,000 budget was not fully subscribed, L. Rissling Wynn asked if there were ideas for the remaining \$5,000, including re-advertising the incentive in a few weeks.
- C. Hojnowski suggested bumping up the incentive amount for the five applicants or use the remaining money to support energy efficiency measures such as Nest thermostats or energy audits. L. Rissling Wynn responded that we will consider ideas and that the budget was approved for "GHG

initiatives” so there is flexibility on how to spend it. She noted that A. Fournier would like to use the remainder for a second round of studded bike tire incentives this fall.

- K. Thieme asked if why there were so few solar applications. L. Rissling Wynn responded that she guesses that people find the price too high with no provincial incentive. R. Daniels commented that the “yo-yo-ing” of government incentives makes it challenging for people to undertake energy efficient retrofits. People tend to wait for incentives or get discouraged when they take them away. L. Rissling Wynn noted this is a struggle and we’ve seen a decline in the solar applications since the Province took away their solar incentive.

E. ROUNDTABLE

- L. Rissling Wynn advised of the following events:
 - Calgary Region Airshed Zone (CRAZ): [Let’s Talk About Air Quality Forum](#), Monday, March 16, 6:00-9:00 pm at the Canmore Collegiate High School Theatre
 - Global and Bow Valley Water Security with Dr. Jay Famiglietti, put on by Bow Valley Climate Action. Tuesday, March 17, 7:30-9:00 pm at the Canmore Civic Centre.
- C. Hojnowski advised of the following events:
 - [Energy Efficiency Financing Solutions Workshop](#), Thursday, March 26, 6:30 pm (presenters start at 7 pm) – 8:30 pm at the Canmore Civic Centre.
 - [Sustainable Building Symposium](#), April 16, 9:00 am-5:00 pm, at The Malcolm and Silvertip. R. Daniels underscored how important this event is and voiced concern about builders and developers not attending when it is such a valuable learning opportunity.
 - [Bear Day 2020](#), Saturday, April 18, 9:00 am-3:00 pm, Canmore Nordic Centre.
- A. Fournier provided a brief overview of the scope and plans for the Renewable Energy Feasibility Study. PPT slides are attached. As time did not allow for a discussion if EARC members have thoughts on the study as outlined, please email them to amy.fournier@canmore.ca.

F. ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting adjourned at 7:03 pm.
- L. Rissling Wynn will be in communication about the next meeting. The first Monday in April falls on the school spring break so there may be a potential need to move it to later in April.



Karena Thieme, Vice Chairperson

Amy Fournier

Amy Fournier, Recorder