

TOWN OF CANMORE
MINUTES
Environmental Advisory Review Committee
Zoom online
4 pm Monday December 13, 2021

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Raina	Chair
Glynis Carling	Public Member
Ken Hodges	Public Member
Ralph Walicki	Public Member
Kevin ONeil	Public Member
Jeff Mah	Council Representative

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Waverly Birch	Public Member
---------------	---------------

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT

Amy Fournier	Energy and Climate Action Coordinator
--------------	---------------------------------------

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT

None

Action items in red.

A. CALL TO ORDER and APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4:02pm

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- Amy provided an update on what was covered at the orientation with the new members; the role of EARC as per the bylaw, the strategies and areas that EARC advise on, and the background on the request to update the EIS policy and EARC bylaw.
- Glynis asked if there is scheduled update for the ESAP planned, or if there is an intention to review the targets and actions for water conservation, waste reduction or toxin reduction. Amy responded that there is nothing planned at this time. Progress on ESAP targets has been reported via the Public Works Annual Report because the ESAP areas are, for the most part, under the purview of Public Works departments. The role of the ESAP should be discussed at a future EARC meeting because that plan hasn't been updated since 2013 and staff time and resources have shifted to the Climate Action Plan implementation since 2019.
- Glynis suggested that municipal water quality be included in any future versions of the ESAP.
- Amy will find out what policy or strategy dictates water quality.
- Jeff Mah stated that in February 2022 the new Council will do its strategic planning work and set the priorities that will govern the next four years.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4:15pm

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. Minutes from the September 13, 2021 EARC meeting

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Update on Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) status

- Amy advised that the Manager of Planning and Development has said that there are no EISes on the horizon at this point.

2. Input on Memo to the General Manager of Municipal Infrastructure regarding integration of climate change and traditional ecological knowledge into EIS Terms of Reference

- Amy summarized that at the September 13, 2021 there was a redlining exercise of the existing EIS policy. EARC members requested to add Climate Change Mitigation, Climate Change Adaptation, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, and Historical and Archeological Resources to the scope of the EIS policy, and for EARC to review and provide input into the Terms of Reference.
- After the September 13 meeting, Amy was advised to send a memo to the General Manager of Municipal Infrastructure to update her. Amy asked for the member's input on the memo drafted to send to the General Manager of Municipal Infrastructure.
- Glynis and Bob advised that the original request started with the two TSMV EIS reviews, around December 2020. They were given 10 days or less to review them both. Bob had pushed back to get four weeks to review, but even this was a very tight timeline, given the size of the documents, especially for the members that aren't retired.
- Bob suggested that there needs to be something in the EIS Policy to ensure the timelines are appropriate, suggesting a potential minimum timeline of 60 days. He would like a clear understanding of the process and at what point EARC is seeing the EIS, and potentially for EARC to receive it at the same time as the Third Party Reviewer (TPR).
- Ken stated that he found that getting the EIS after the TPR was very helpful and feels it is appropriate to have it after the TPR is finished.
- Glynis flagged the issue of potential additional work for EARC members having to look at multiple versions of the document if there are iterations between the TPR and proponent.
- Bob and other members agreed that EARC having the EIS after the TPR is completed is likely the best option, however, the timeline for EARC to review needs to start at the point they receive it, not at the same time as the TPR starts. Ken feels that 60 days is reasonable (for something as large as TSMV) for retired members but suggests that we need to consult with working members
- Kevin suggested 'up to 60 days' so that it leaves the option for quicker reviews with smaller EISes. Ken feels that 60 days is appropriate (for something as large as the TSMV EISes) from his perspective as being a retired member, but suggests that we need to consult with EARC members who are still working.
- Amy to check and see if there is anything in the policy dictating timeline.
- Glynis advised that it was first flagged by members during the TSMV EIS reviews that impacts on climate change should be included in this. There had been a redlined document earlier, with former member Rick Daniel proposing the change.
- Amy to double check that the initial request was only for the project's contributions to climate change (greenhouse gas emissions) and confirm date by looking at previous meeting minutes.
- Amy advised that there will be impacts on stakeholders and there will need to be consultation before updating the policy. She asked members to advise on any additional stakeholders that should be consulted beyond the following groups: Town of Canmore Planning and Development Department, Third Party Reviewer Consultant, Local First Nations, BOWDA, and Bow Valley Climate Action
- Ken brought up a concern that Wildlife Corridors are the Province's responsibility, but we have no idea how or why they came up with the specific corridors. We should have a better idea of their decision-making influences given the significant impacts from development on wildlife in the area. Jeff believes that EARC and Council should have input and some authority on wildlife corridors.
- Jeff asked if we need to apply the word "Indigenous" to Archeological and Historic Resources and Traditional Ecological Knowledge to be more specific.

- The discussion ended before going through the entire memo outline. Amy will follow up with the questions she'd like more input on.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion on First Nations consultation with the General Manager of Municipal Services tentatively scheduled for January meeting

- Amy advised that the General Manager of Municipal Services, who is currently leading much of the Town's Truth and Reconciliation work, passed along the message that the Stoney Admin has indicated that they are not, at this time, interested in providing TEK studies. She advised that while many people are trying to quickly advance TRC, this work is challenging, and we need to be respectful of what the Stoney Nakoda are interested in and have the resources to provide.
- Ken asked if there was a provincial framework that dictates how First Nations Archeological Assessments are to be provided. In BC, there was a process where a key year dictated where a full assessment had to be completed. Bob stated that for large projects in Alberta, usually there is a requirement to do Archeological Assessments. Glynis says in her experience it often depends on region. The scope can vary from a walk around with elders to a detailed report.
- Bob stated that it was missing from TSMV. He is not sure if it is covered anywhere else. If this isn't in the EIS policy, where will Indigenous consultation requirements be captured?
- Glynis suggested that this is a good question for our GM of Municipal Services. Who is responsible for getting this information and making sure a development reflects what was found through the process?
- Ken asked if EARC members can interact with First Nations representatives if there are questions during the process or if clarification is needed about what a proponent has provided, or whether that would strictly be the Town. It was suggested to include the questions about who is best suited to follow up with local First Nations, if information is needed from EARC during the EIS process, in our discussion with our GM of Municipal Services.
- Jeff noted that it is a challenging time for the Stoney Nakoda. There are a lot of people trying to get information from them. It is still imperative that we keep reaching out and making the effort. The process can be slow.
- **Members can send more questions on this topic to Amy prior to the next meeting so she can send them to the GM in advance.**

2. Input on future discussions relating to wildlife at the January or February meeting

- Bob is concerned about the high number of incidents with bears in fruit trees, which doesn't align with the Town's stated values of being a WildSmart community. He feels that the fruit tree policy is not working given the situation with the number of bears re-located. He is also concerned that the off-leash dog policy doesn't seem to be effective. Jeff agrees that the number of bear incidents and removals this year is unacceptable.
- Amy passed along that there 3 fruit tree warnings, as well as 8 citations and 24 warnings for off-leash dogs.
- Bob suggests EARC needs further discussion within the committee about these issues.
- Ken asked if there something that EARC members can identify a specific concern. Could Biosphere potentially provide some advice?
- Jeff suggests Nick de Ruyter from the Biosphere WildSmart program can advise on this issue. Jeff feels the big challenge is enforcement. It may be an issue where the policy doesn't need to be changed but needs to be better enforced.

- Amy passed along a message from Bylaw that they were down in staff this year and not able to dedicate the same resources to fruit tree education and enforcement as in 2020. If they can fill the approved positions for 2022, they will be making a more concerted effort with dog off-leash patrols and being proactive with fruit trees. Jeff advised that staffing this department is challenging. There is also lead time required in training to enable officers to give the citations.
- Jeff asked members for their thoughts on education versus enforcement and that this is a good topic for future EARC meeting discussions.
- Ken asked if we could go to Council about our concerns. Ken suggests potentially developing some frameworks to guide it. Bob advises that we don't have the wildlife expertise on the Committee but there are other resources that could be tapped by the Town to advise and review policy. EARC's role could be to bring the issue to Council, in order to draw it to their attention and ask that it be made a higher priority for them to address.
- Glynis feels that this is an issue appropriate for EARC and supports getting a wildlife person to advise at next meeting. If not EARC, then who is the group that advises Council on this issue?
- Ken asked if fuel management is part of EARC's mandate. Ken is wondering if we can FireSmart and increase habitat at the same time.
- The Committee needs to decide what our advice to Council is and the outcome we are looking for. Jeff advises that it is a good idea to keep flagging for Council.
- Amy to talk to Nick de Ruyter about coming to a future meeting to advise on this issue.
- An update on the Keep Wildlife Alive campaign and getting EARC members' advice on good locations for the campaign signs were not discussed due to lack of time.

3. Discussion on EARC providing direct reports to Council

- Bob had brought up a concern that the only time EARC advises Council is via an EIS and this is limited to whether an EIS meets the Terms of Reference. EARC, however, is not just a Review Committee but also an Advisory one. He feels that it would be beneficial to Council to hear from EARC on other issues and concerns. He is also concerned about how long things take when it is the staff taking it up through the bureaucracy and perhaps a direct link to Council would be beneficial.
- Amy had checked with the Clerk's office and the advice provided was to go through Committee of the Whole (CoW) meetings. At CoW meetings, Council hears updates and information only. Regular Council meetings are reserved for staff reports where there is a request to Council for a decision.
- Glynis thinks it is a good idea to have some visibility once or twice a year with Council. It also allows Council to make requests to the Committee, which is also part of the Committee mandate.
- Jeff believes that Council would support and appreciate this and agrees with the Committee of the Whole approach. A verbal report is helpful once or twice a year. There is also the opportunity to provide written submissions in the Agenda Package that goes to Council. Jeff can include an EARC update via his Council submissions/updates to CoW, or the staff liaison can include in the staff updates.
- Ken asked how this would differ from the formal process. Bob replied that when EARC completes an EIS, Bob in his official role as Chair, provides an accompanying letter to Council. He suggests he could provide a letter or memo to Council for other issues.
- Kevin agrees that doing an annual summary presentation is great.
- Committee members agree that they would like to verbally present at a minimum of once per year, and, in addition, provide ongoing reports or summaries either in person or in written reports, as issues arise.
- Amy will check with the Municipal Clerk's Office to see if a Bylaw amendment is necessary to formalize these presentations to Council. We already have to do a Bylaw amendment because of the requested change in EARC's role with the EIS Policy (advising on the Terms of Reference). If

a formal update specifying an annual presentation (at a minimum) is required, this could be done at the same time.

4. 2022 Budget Requests for Town of Canmore Environmental initiatives

- Amy provided the attached slide. Council makes their final decision on the budget on December 14, 2021. [Note added post meeting: Council approved these requests on December 14, 2021].
- Glynis asked about whether there was a budget request needed for the Clean Energy Improvement Program (CEIP). Amy confirmed that it is a financing program where the Town borrows money to pay for the upfront retrofit cost and then the resident pays it back over time, so no Capital budget request is required. Amy advised that we are awaiting the funding decision from FCM's CEF program.

E. UPDATES

1. Council Update – Councillor Jeff Mah

- As reported in the Rocky Mountain Outlook, TSMVPL is suing the Town of Canmore and former Council for 161 million dollars.
- The hiring of the new CAO is still in process. Jeff noted there was consternation from some groups about climate change not being in the job posting. Jeff stated that Council's response is that hiring someone with a desire and ability to move forward on climate initiatives, and hopefully a proven track record, is a priority. They were, however, counselled by the recruitment consultant not to get too specific in the posting because it would 'shrink the net'. This issue is important to Council and will be part of the interview and resume vetting process.
- With respect to discussions about the potential new passenger train between Banff to Calgary, Jeff advised that while Canmore will be directly impacted, we don't have say or leverage in the decision. Most of it is being led/decided by the Banff-based proponent, CP Rail and Calgary. Calgary is keen to have an airport to downtown train. Right now, the thought is that every 15 minutes a train would go between the Airport to downtown Calgary and there would also be ten trains per day to Banff. Council is trying to make sure Canmore's perspectives are understood and focus discussions on how to mitigate impacts on Canmore, as it will result in increased train traffic. Stoney Nakoda are also impacted as they will have to have another train line going through their lands. The proposed benefits are also unclear. If the train is diesel instead of hydrogen, there may not actually be reduced GHGs. The cost of taking the train and logistics may be less attractive compared, compared to car travel, especially for families, so there may not be a reduction in vehicle traffic. This may be something that EARC will have to look at.
- Bob asked when it will come before Council. Jeff replied that it won't come before Council because we aren't part of the decision. The proponent feels that this will be done as early as 2025. If a train station in Canmore is being considered, EARC may have a role.
- Ken is concerned about additional trains impacting intersection at railway and Bow Valley Trail. Jeff agreed that there will be impacts at this intersection, but we don't have any say in whether the project proceeds or not.
- Jeff advised that the Palliative Care proposal may be coming forward with a request to change urban growth boundary, in the early part of 2022 and that EARC may have a role. Bob noted that they already reviewed an EIS for this as part of a larger South Canmore development.

1. Roundtable updates

- Amy advised that she is scheduled to provide a Climate Action at the January COW. **Amy will send the report out a few days ahead of the Council meeting.**
- Ken asked if the notes taken from this meeting are internal or will go to Council. Amy reported that they will be in the public minutes and follow up will happen regarding the EIS discussion, but nothing is going to Council directly.

- Amy advised that we are part of the Circular Cities and Regions Initiative, led by FCM, National Zero Waste Council, Recycling Council of Alberta and Recyc-Quebec. The outcome is a Circular Economy Roadmap. It will be relevant to EARC to help determine how this will fit with the rest of our strategies.
- Amy advised that she has teamed up with Manager of Community Development to join the Community Climate Transitions Community of Practice cohort, a new initiative from the Tamarack Foundation. This program will support the Town in ensuring that we are putting a social justice and equity lens on our climate work and achieving multiple benefits.

D. NEXT MEETING

1. Scheduling the January meeting and additional agenda items

- The Vice chair election will need to take place at an upcoming meeting. The Vice Chair acts as Chair when Bob is unavailable.
- Amy recognized that we should be doing land acknowledgements at the start of EARC meetings and suggested that members take turns doing this. We would develop a schedule so that people know in advance and can prepare. Members should email Amy directly if they are uncomfortable with this.
- Next meeting scheduled for January 17 at 4 pm.

E. ADJOURNMENT – MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:55 PM

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY