



AGENDA
RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Saanich Municipal Hall, Council Chambers
Tuesday, February 16, 2021, 6:30 p.m.

Due to COVID-19 measures, Saanich is unable to accommodate the public for any Council, Committee of the Whole, Advisory, Board or Foundation meetings while maintaining the limits on large gatherings due to the Public Health Order.

As per the Order of the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General, *Emergency Program Act*, Ministerial Order No. M192, public attendance at the meeting is not required if it cannot be accommodated in accordance with the applicable requirements or recommendations under the Public Health Act.

To listen to this meeting by telephone call **1-877-385-4099** and use code **6563094#** during the time noted above.

1	Territorial Acknowledgement & Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Statement	Councillor Mersereau	
2	Call to Order and Approval of Agenda	Chair S. Guy	5 mins
3	Adoption of Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 8, 2020 • January 19, 2021 	Chair S. Guy	5 mins
4	Receipt of Correspondence	Chair S. Guy	5 mins
5	Update from Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent and upcoming staff tasks related to RSTC • Plans for reporting on public input 	Staff	10 mins
6	Optional updates from working groups	Working Groups	15 mins
7	Discussion about mapping		60 mins
8	Work planning discussion		50 mins

**** Next Meeting: March 18, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. in Council Chambers ****
Please RVSP your attendance to lynn.merry@saanich.ca

MINUTES
RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Conference Call
December 8, 2020, at 6:30 pm

Item 3(a)

Present: Councillor Rebecca Mersereau (Council Liaison), Bev Windjack, Brian Wilkes (Chair), Tory Stevens, Jeremy Gye, Purnima Govindarajulu, Stewart Guy, Brian Emmett, Tim Ennis, Kevin Brown

Staff: Adriane Pollard, Manager of Environmental Services; Thomas Munson, Senior Environmental Planner

Regrets: Eva Riccius, Senior Manager Parks

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Mersereau called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. and acknowledged the First Nations Territories in which Saanich is located.

The meeting was called specifically to receive a presentation on the new Saanich map atlas.

The Chair advised the two guests from public calling in to please not speak during the meeting but rather provide feedback to Thomas Munson at Thomas.Munson@saanich.ca.

Committee members were welcomed and general housekeeping procedures were reviewed for the conference call meeting.

Approval of the Agenda. Moved by Tim Ennis and Seconded by Brian Emmett.

CARRIED

Chair thanks Adriane Pollard for developing this presentation on short notice. Importance of mapping and getting mapping correct emphasized. Very useful not only to the Committee but also critical to the public's trust in mapping. Public trust emphasized as important, valuable and a necessity – as is key elements of stewardship programs.

This evening's presentation will focus on the GIS layers and Environmental Reference Atlas. Neither are legal tools.

Chair: Please hold questions until end of presentation.

2. PRESENTATION: DRAFT SAANICH ENVIRONMENTAL MAPPING

The Manager of Environmental Services presented the "Saanich Environmental Mapping" PDF (provided to committee members by email).

- The presentation is a tour of the 4th draft addition of the atlas.
- To help committee with resources and stimulate some feedback and further discussion.
- GIS layers display lots of things, and can be updated on regular basis.

SLIDE TWO: PURPOSE OF GIS AND THE ATLAS

It was noted that:

- Accessible information from multiple sources to anyone who is interested,
- Training not needed in order to use.
- Allows users to locate where and what they are looking at.
- Used as a flagging tool.

SLIDE THREE: ERA Atlas – why have one?

- Not everyone has a computer. And some they prefer to carry an atlas in their work truck. Very accessible.
- The library also carries this Atlas.
- Comes with additional maps.
- Uses the Saanich map grid system for cross-referencing with all other Saanich map books.
- Have had the atlas since 1999.
- Council direction that we keep up to date with this data

SLIDE FOUR: 1999/2020

- A comparison between 1999 and 2020 data was made.
- Draft edition of same area: roads, property lines; inventory always being updated as new technology arrives.
- Still continue making refinements and will continue to do so.
- Very happy to have been approved for an Environmental GIS Analyst in the Planning Department therefore the data can be updated more efficiently.

SLIDE FIVE: SAANICH MAP GRID SYSTEM

- Map grid is a tool for cross referencing with other atlases.

SLIDE SIX: FACTORS AFFECTING ACCURACY

- Purpose of inventory is important when considering accuracy.
- Staff budget and therefore the technology has been lacking, has been a problem but now that we have the GIS Analyst, time and efforts can be dedicated to this.
- Methods and standards of the inventory.
- Skills of people collecting, mapping, storing and digitalizing the information.
- Changes in landscape – houses, forest cut, all things that effect mapping accuracy.
- Access to land – verification for polygon, best way is to actually go to a property but there are limitations with private property.
- Scale of inventory – once it is on GIS, users can zoom in on their property
- Difference of opinion as to what should be in the inventory.
- Purpose – most important factor. Knowing the purpose can help determine level of accuracy.

SLIDE SEVEN: VERIFICATION OF INVENTORIES

- The table is a draft.
- Overall verification of the polygons is high in Saanich, either through visual check or ground inspection.

- Refining boundaries can be done in many ways but most often it is done by aerial photo interpretation.
- Variety of methods and standards.
- Overall verification is fairly high but still could be issues that could make verification difficult. Verification information isn't always included in the data but the GIS Technician is working on adding this.

SLIDE EIGHT: VERIFICATION AND ACCURACY

- Most cases air photo interpretation is used to determine boundaries.
- Characteristics are best achieved with ground or visual verification when a professional biologist is involved.
- Accuracy is best achieved when a surveyor plots the boundaries, especially when development is involved.

SLIDE NINE: CDF, SEI, SEM

- Lots of overlap between inventories, but they are not all the same. Not all inventories use two letter codes such as CB or FS, but we have used this method which saves space in the legend and makes interpretation easier.
- CDF – very difficult to access as a map (as opposed to a database). Had to go through expert to work with the data and make it useable. All of Saanich is mapped in CDF so we have filtered out less significant data.
- Sharing this info with CRD, etc. who are very interested. In order to make it more accessible and easy to understand. Another source of info for people.
- Coastal Douglas Fir (CDF) data: Provincial data mainly from 2008 Terrestrial Ecosystem Mapping databases (TEM);
- Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory (SEI): Federal and Provincial data assembled in 1992 and reviewed in 2002;
- Saanich Ecosystem Mapping (SEM): Municipal database assembled from 2012-2014). SEM is the product of 3 years of data collection as part of a strategic plan initiative which started in 2012. The methodology was very similar to SEI and there was a technical committee overseeing its development. Funding was contributed by the federal government.
- A few differences but because we are only interested in Saanich ecosystems we were able to get a good amount of detail.

SLIDE TEN: COMPARISON OF ECOSYSTEM MAPPING/INVENTORIES

- CDC: rare species and rare ecosystems.
- CDF: very broad, doesn't always look at the vegetation. Example: can be used after a clear cut. Not always looking for pristine but rather what the land would produce.
- SEI: niche ecosystems, provincial standards.
- SEM: consultant developed a standard.

SLIDE ELEVEN: CDF, SEI, SEM – OVERLAPPING

- Differences and also similarities – young forest and second growth, as an example.
- Inventories that flag areas for a closer look if it is helpful to the user.
- Young forest – 100 hectares or greater in size. Example: Noble Creak young forest polygon is example on slide 10.

SLIDE TWELVE: RARE PLANT, ANIMAL. OR PLANT ASSOCIATION (CDC)

- Produced by BC Government, we do not alter polygons, we either publish or don't publish.
- We also filter out large polygons as these are not useful for most users.
- Saanich residents can access all of the data through province.
- Seventy-eight percent of this CDC inventory data is located on public land.

SLIDES TWELVE & THIRTEEN: SAANICH MARINE INVENTORY

- May not be entirely on public GIS.
- DFO funded a project. Used to show wildlife habitat, among other things, as a Snapshot in time.
- Assembled by Veins of Life Watershed Society and Saanich from 1999-2000 field work.
- Marine shoreline is categories according to consistent vegetation, type, depth of vegetation.
- This inventory has not been repeated – best that we have to date.

SLIDE FOURTEEN: MIGRATORY BIRD SANCUTUARY

- Links are on the website to take users to see further information.

SLIDE FIFTEEN: WILDLIFE TREE AREA

- Birds return to these sites on annual basis so provincially protected.
- The circle represents the provincially recommended 60m buffer.
- BC Federation of Naturalists fund this program.
- Significant Trees are ones that are listed in Tree Bylaw based on many reasons.

SLIDE SIXTEEN: NATURAL STATE COVENANT

- Legal agreements between private land owners and Saanich.
- Usually as a result of approved development proposals.
- Staff encourage establishing covenants in clusters. Tend to see them along shorelines, park boundaries, designated in local area plans.
- Boundaries are very accurate because they have been surveyed.

SLIDE SEVENTEEN: SAANICH WETLAND

- Not many in inventory but 64 percent found on private land.
- Many are not in streamside DP areas because they are not fish bearing.

SLIDE EIGHTEEN: WATER COURSE

- Not all watercourses are necessarily in the Streamside Atlas.
- Culverts can also be seen to show where the watercourse travel.

SLIDE NINETEEN: NEED SOME CLARITY?

- Mapping needs to be interpreted so we help people use this information at counter, over the phone, etc.

SLIDE 20: NEXT STEPS

- Pros and cons to governments making changes to other governments mapping.
- For example, raises issues about trespassing on private property and verification standards.
- Accessing info in GIS: right click on polygon and it gives users all the attributes, etc.
- Hoping to have verification added to the attributes.
- Consolidating databases – important for legal maps.

End of Presentation and back to Chair

Tim: Thank you Adriane for presenting and taking time out of evening. I work with this sort of data and I can tell you have done a good job in approaching this. Encourage Saanich to update the SEI. We have done that in Comox and it is very useful. Point out that the mapping was done in the entire basin so that local government can put in place regulations for protecting. This is a very important step

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON PRESENTATION:

1) Are the base layers complex in the CDF TEM?

- Yes the base layers are very complex polygons, more complex than the SEI data. Users are able to right click on the areas and get a lot of detailed information.
- Maybe should be referred to as TEM rather than CDF. Saanich should be applauded that it is able to give out this info to the public. Unfortunately the information is easy to misinterpret therefore encourage Saanich to use TEM, as this is what they are calling it elsewhere.
- The focus has been on CDF rather than TEM. It has been decided that it is more understandable to users therefore calling it CDF rather than TEM to date.

2) Does anyone go out to monitor the natural state covenant areas so that the covenant documents are being followed through with? Is Saanich following up?

- Yes, when we receive complaints or if there is an infraction at building permit stage or development stage we are able to follow up with an inspection.
- Photopoint monitoring was done but because the covenants are on private property, it was not popular with all landowners.
- Yes, a brochure is sent to property owners every three years or so as a reminder. We aren't able to proactively monitor them but we do follow up when we can. We did a study a few years back to look at the covenants and we found a high success rate. As a note, some areas should not have been covenanted. But when the covenant is a good idea, we find a high success rate.

3) What does the natural state covenant reminder brochure say?

- It is a friendly reminder about the covenant and what it entails. It also asks that if there are questions to please call Saanich Planning. It states the things that property owners are able to do, such as invasive species removal, and not do. If they have questions or concerns Environmental Services will go out and follow up.
- At all levels of governments, there are standards and practices for code of ethics but have found there is a minimum standard for covenants.

- 4) It was discussed whether the whole committee should be copied when questions sent to Adriane or Thomas.
- The decision was made: yes.
- 5) Will the ERA Atlas scale and purpose will be something that is built up over time. Is there an expectation of what is true and what is not true?
- Yes, it is part of the reason that we brought this atlas to the group.
 - There is a stigma about accuracy. And what the mapping is flagging.
 - Hesitant to touch the inventories, as users will start to take them as accurate therefore keeping landscaping, patios, roofs, etc. out of the equation may help with some of this.
 - The purpose is as a flagging tool.
- 6) It has been questioned as to why we have published new layers now.
- We have been working on the new inventories for several years.
 - We can now start to refine all the years of work we have not been able to accomplish without the necessary resources.
 - If there ever was an EDPA in the future there will be major work to determine how this will happen and to get it in condition acceptable to the public.
- 7) Does the Marine inventory cover all the Gorge area and outer coast?
- Yes, all of those areas were included in the inventory.
- 8) How do the Federal government and the Province regard the SEM data?
- During the first phase of mapping, the public was invited to nominate sites to map. The second phase sites were determined by consultants and land owners who gave permission to access their properties. The third phase was based on engagement with the land owners who felt that land owner permission should not exclude mapping. Therefore the consultants tried their best to complete the inventory with available information.
 - Provincial Government said they wouldn't put this information into the SEI database because we didn't use the same polygon size threshold. Also, wetlands, older forests, rare species were targeted and restoration potential was considered an attribute.
 - SEI inventory was done almost 20 years ago so mature growth forests and other things have changed since.
 - It was noted that LiDAR was used in SEM data to draw out older forests.
- 9) Modified SEI, could this be leading to one broadly agreed definition of what and ESA is?
- Are moving away from the term Environmentally Significant Area for the atlas.
 - Modified SEI will be used from now on but we can't go back and apply it to other mapping systems.
 - There is not enough information for stewardship.
 - It would be the holy grail if we could have one clear cut definition but nature works in funny ways and it would be a hard target to chase.
- 10) Some members of public and staff like to carry around paper copies of the Atlas. Will there will be another version for them?

- Yes, we have a list of people who would like one. And the public is able to receive one for a cost.
- 11) How this information is currently used by Saanich staff in your department and others departments. Also, who uses it and how they use it?
- Atlas has more environmental information than shown in GIS.
- Some layers are not published but are in the Atlas, such as covenants.
- Our staff use the Atlas:
 - On site;
 - In an emergency situation, when we quickly need to know of sensitive areas needing protection;
 - Planning out capital projects to get advance notice of impacts;
 - Advising residents when they ask to build something whether the property is in a Streamside Development Permit Area;
 - Making recommendations about erosion control, Garry oak areas, rare species.
 - To advise real estate agents for their clients as a feature to present all this information to the potential buyer.
- 12) Clarify purpose of Atlas. Is there avenue for the committee to encourage discussion of the atlas?
- Main goal is for public to have the information. But please advise us on where you see improvements that could be made.
- 13) It is not a legal tool, what does this mean?
- EDPA had its own Atlas and was considered under the Bylaw. ESA Atlas has always been there it just has never been part of the Bylaw but rather it is just for information. Therefore the atlas has no legal bearing.

QUESTION PERIOD WRAP UP

Hopefully this will lead to more conversations. There is a lot of info here and looking forward to continue to engage with this. This was the objective for this evening.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting Schedule

Committee members discussed the following:

- Whether Carolyn Richman can send out Drop box or Google to decide on whether which tool to use to schedule meetings moving forward.
- It is difficult to book or change meeting space due to covid.
- Decided that a particular date every month be chosen such as every second Tuesday of each month rather than doodle polls.
- Decided that a webpage for document sharing was not ideal as only staff can access it and therefore no longer wanted.

Action: Check with Legislative Services if every second Tuesday of each month is an option.

5. WORKPLAN, MILESTONES & SCHEDULE

- Draft 10, the committee will try to turn around as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment moved by Tim Ennis and seconded by Brian Emmett. The meeting adjourned at 8:23 pm.

NEXT MEETING

January 19, 2021

Brian Wilkes, Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

Committee Secretary

MINUTES
RESILIENT SAANICH TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Conference Call
January 19, 2021 at 6:30 pm

Item 3(b)

Present: Councillor Rebecca Mersereau (Council Liaison), K. Brown, B. Windjack, Brian Wilkes, T. Stevens, J. Gye, P. Govindarajulu, Stewart Guy, Brian Emmett

Staff: A. Pollard, Manager of Environmental Services; T. Munson, Senior Environmental Planner, L. Hatch, Senior Manager of Water Resources Engineering

Regrets:

1. WELCOME

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

Councillor R. Mersereau acknowledged the First Nations Territories Saanich is located in. Acknowledged and thank everyone for their commitment to the committee. She also committed to celebrating of the people within Saanich. It was also noted, how much work has been put in even over the holidays and how much this is appreciated.

Chair thanks B. Wilkes for his past work as past Chair.

Committee members were welcomed and general housekeeping procedures were reviewed for the conference call/meeting.

2. ADOPTION OF NOVEMBER 24, 2020 MINUTES

The Chair asked to make two minor changes to the January 19th, 2021 agenda:

- 1) Change agenda items 5 and 6.
- 2) Move the mapping to the next meeting, (TBD) as tonight's agenda is full and to allow more time to prepare for this topic.

Motion: MOVED by B. Wilkes and Seconded by P. Govindarajulu: "That the Agenda be accepted, with the revision that mapping be removed for this Agenda and moved to the next Agenda and also to move agenda items 5 to 6 and 6 to 5 on this meeting's Agenda.

CARRIED

Motion: MOVED by B. Wilkes and Seconded by T. Stevens: "That the minutes from the November 24, 2020, meeting be adopted, as amended, with the GIS Technician staff person's name removed."

CARRIED

3. UPDATE FROM THE RSTC COUNCIL LIAISON

Councilor Mersereau provided an update, noting:

- RSTC was approved as a committee to use MS Teams virtually. The option is either everyone on line on MS Teams or a shared in person conference call meeting. The reason being that there seems to be an incapability between MS Teams and the software in this particular room and this is the only room at the Hall where meetings are being held due to physical distancing. By March it is expected that people can choose to join MS Teams or come in person.
- First Nation's representative – one of two steps in the process of First Nations representative joining this committee. There is an interested candidate but this still has to be formalized and Council still has to consider.
- It was requested that once the First Nations candidate has been confirmed, to have them have a briefing with staff to get an overview and update of the Committee.

ACTION: First Nation candidate to have a briefing with staff once their appointment has been confirmed by Council.

4. PRESENTATION: Integrated Stormwater Management Plan – Presenter Ian Bruce.

It was noted by the Chair:

- Water management overall is one of the committee's key themes.
- This is an appropriate time to hear presentation discuss integrated Storm Management as it is a key time of year regarding rainwater.

Ian Bruce made a presentation on Integrated Stormwater Management Planning. It was noted:

Presentation is based on a previous presentation that was given to the Environment and Natural Areas Committee in 2014.

Presenter Ian Bruce: Biologist - marine and terrestrial environments. Co-founder of Peninsula Streams. A lot of experience working in the Peninsula.

It was noted that perhaps the plans should be called Integrated Water Resource Conservation and Management Plans. Stormwater invokes a negative connotation of rainwater water and something to get rid of as fast as you can. Notes that this has been reflected in planning and engineering approaches historically with infrastructure to encourage stormwater exiting the landscape as fast as possible.

Why SMP, Why Saanich and Why now.

- Central Saanich was encourage to undertake ISMP with reference to Tetayut Creek watershed and Hagen Creek Watershed. Also Martindale Flats which drains into Saanich (Noble Creek).

- Beneficial to have all or most of a watershed, like the Colquitz, within a municipality because then you are not dependant on another municipality or the CRD to manage a part of it. You have control of the whole watershed.
- Central Saanich did undertake the ISMP – farmers and the Creek’s interest were the two driving factors behind this. Municipality found funding and Del Can picked it up. Created a framework for what could be done.
- Central Saanich took this template and were then able to add more funding in the future.
- Project went over 2008-2009.
- Consultants, Landscape Architects, Engineering with the help of a Steering Committee. Council accepted report and recommendations and a watershed committee of stakeholders was formed. The same committee that did the planning for it was also there for the implantations.
- Central Saanich won a National planning award for this.
- The Committee would be important as a way of helping prioritize and bring in the stakeholders interest as the plan was undertaken.
- The Plan Components are Hydrological, Biophysical, water quality and is centered around rainwater from planning through to engineering and looking through to the future. Brings all the bits and pieces together.
- Things like downspout disconnection, impervious surfaces, raingardens and wetlands. Many of the things that Saanich has already been doing but if the ISM was done Saanich could do the integration itself.
- Presented a piece of land on the map where it would be nice for Saanich to do. Good mix of urban and Agriculture of a watershed.
- Worked with Staff and Committees to come up with a plan.

Questions were posed by committee members to Ian Bruce regarding the presentation:

- 1) What problems would an Integrated Storm Management Plan solve in the Swan Creek Drainage?
 - Enhanced Storage
 - A weir at the end of Swan Lake.
 - Could utilize Reed Canary grass field for winter storage and complexed to provide for ecological function.
 - Could clean up dirty culverts on Carey Road.
 - Older infrastructure that could be improved. Construct a wetlands or rain garden to mitigate impacts of pipes. The things that would be have been integrated at a time when road work was being done.
- 2) Where you have implanted storm management plan, is it being monitored on a regular basis and is it being monitored by volunteers?
 - Contract with District of Central Saanich looking at water quality coming out of Keating industrial areas and we monitor with volunteers on a monthly basis.
 - Also monitor the watersheds at their downstream locations. This was part of the recommendations of the IMSP.

- 3) Does management plan have to be looked at as a living document? How often does this document have to be looked at as a living document?
- We accomplished 75-80 percent of the goals and recommendations from the IMSP in Central Saanich but we were hoping that the other 20-25 percent would have been picked up by staff / public in terms of education for the public on rainwater and rainwater management.
 - Given the size of Saanich there is probably lots of opportunity for education within Saanich.

Leslie Hatch, Manager of Engineering was introduced and answered questions regarding Saanich and its role in Stormwater Management.

- 4) Take the idea of integrated stormwater on a municipal basis and are developing specific watershed plans for specific watershed drainages – is this fundamentally what you do?
- Yes, that is what we do. There are many different watersheds within the area but it is fortunate when a particular watershed is in one municipality and doesn't flow into other watersheds but this is sometimes not the case. We recognize that watersheds don't end at the municipal boundaries.

Councilor Mersereau provided an update, noting:

- The Engineering Department has quite recently taken off a bite of the stormwater management and is in the process of planning out a multi-year project that is starting with drainage studies with a focus on hydrology. If this committee is interested in learning where Saanich is in this process, perhaps this can be a topic of discussion at a future meeting.

ACTION: Potentially another meeting with L. Hatch and I. Bruce.

5. WORKING GROUP UPDATES

The Biodiversity Group provided an update as follows:

- The group started out trying to focus on a biodiversity conservation strategy and writing out a table of contents with Brian as lead. Realized that it needed to be a step by step process.
- Step One of this process is to get some base line data, state of biodiversity as it is now that will set baseline metrics, and also prioritize we need some basic information.
- Started to outline the Foundational Document. This can also be called the State of Biodiversity in Saanich Report.
- Put in a series of components:
 - 1) Species and Ecosystems – An assessment of species at risk and other species that are important for other reasons.
 - 2) Spatial analysis of the current and future biodiversity interests. Mapping exercise but can be viewed as a mapping plus exercise. Retrospective Analysis of the Green 1972 Green Belt Study in terms of how much has been achieved and how much is still relevant. Not to keep focus on protected areas but also have focus on other areas that have restoration potential. Could service as a secondary function of Biodiversity conservation. Could be burial lands or agricultural lands that have potential.

- 3) Not just look at mapping in spatial context but also evaluate its condition. This might be a huge piece and the methodology may need to be worked out.
- 4) Assessment of Stewardship – the involvement of everybody in this process and not just certain organizations or government. Up for discussion but when we are doing public outreach and consultation for the Environmental Policy Framework, maybe include some questions about stewardship. What is the level of involvement in stewardship now and set goals to increase this stewardship. Or how important this is because we haven't really brought the public input into that Stewardship early on into the process.
- 5) Saanich Focus – look at the current investment. What is being invested in now in terms of time, money, costs from Saanich. Then this can be the baseline data that we can then use. Methodology of evaluating conditions.

The committee will need to decide what is important and what/how we pay for it. Decide what it is that we are looking for and what are valuable components. Whether we hire staff or hire a consultant. All of this to be decided via a motion or support. This document lists all of it. We are not sure if the list is complete.

Questions were posed by Committee members to the Biodiversity Working Group.

It was decided that due to this document being a substantial amount of information, the Committee decided to give an overview of the working groups and if there was any time sensitive issues that the Committee could discuss at this meeting but otherwise leave the rest to be picked up over the next couple of months.

- 1) Hub and corridor concept to be considered as a foundation for a biodiversity strategy in Saanich. Hubs and corridors important corridors for connections, due to the hubs having a high degree of biodiversity in them. We don't know the condition of some of these hubs or what they are connecting to. We need to understand this soon or a schedule for biodiversity plan will slip. Are we talking about native biodiversity or a combination of biodiversity. What kind of guidance can we accept from this Committee regarding this topic.

It was noted:

- It is not clear that exotic species contribute to biodiversity and maybe not make the assumption and sign on to this ideology that all native plants are good and all non-native are not. Conversation around species does not get linked to the underlying ecological processes on which they depend in which give rise to them. The conversation should reflect the processes that are emerging or have recently emerged and how are these effecting the ecosystems within which these species are currently struggling.
- A footnote has been included regarding the connection as to how biodiversity is defined which is species and the ecological process. There is also a reference to a Surrey Biodiversity Strategy.

At the is point the Chair asked the Committee if they want to spend the time on one working groups or do we move this to another meeting. It was decided to continue on with the question period to the biodiversity group.

- 2) Is your group leaning towards more volunteerism? The concern being if the group was mostly volunteers.

It was noted,

- The working group does not want all volunteers and that this plan won't work unless there is a significant investment by the District of Saanich. Stewardship is looking at volunteer and public but also Saanich.
- This is step one of the Conservation Strategy therefore this is collecting the baseline data. And the expectation is that all of the steps will be addressed in the Conservation Strategy. Steps 2-5.
- It was noted that it is clear that the three groups are all working towards a common goal and that they could be working together to work towards this common goal. All three working group interests overlap and have a lot of connections between the three – all working towards Natural Areas Action Plan.

- 3) Do you see field work components associated with as part of this program on the first phase of this project? And to get support for this?

- Looking for a motion to support that we need this base line data and how will we gather this. How much have staff done and where is it compiled. The next step is to understand what has been done and then decide which parts can staff can do and which has to go to an outside contract. Is there field work needed.

A. Pollard, Manager of Environment addressed the question,

- In milestone two of the plan it talks about collating and analysis of known data regarding biodiversity. The Environmental GIS analyst is just getting started gathering this data in terms of what information is out there. The other part at the end of this milestone is that Council will want to know if there is any additional data or studies that need to be collected in order to get to Milestone 3, which is doing the biodiversity study.
- Another meeting with staff and biodiversity group was suggested to let the Biodiversity group know what information staff is working on and what info do you need in order to fill the gaps. Another thing to consider is if the group wants staff to go back in time as Saanich has data (impact assessments) from decades ago. It was suggested that extirpated species were important to document. The species may not be there now but they were and is this important information.
- We are in Milestone 1 and will be reporting to Council in March/April with public feedback, goals and objectives, conservation tool evaluation matrix, and refining the scope for the policy framework and data collection.

- 4) Is it appropriate to be waiting for one Milestone to end before another begins in terms of preparing for contract work, knowing that there is a complicated procurement procedure. Ask Council to allocate some funds to start a contacting process for hiring a consultant to start gather information.

It was the consensus of the committee:

- That the meeting could be not just the biodiversity group but also include the other working groups and the staff. To encourage good ideas and different perspectives.

- Perhaps the Biodiversity Group does give more thought to what was mentioned regarding the species that have been lost in the area and whether it is a good idea to go back in time and use/look at this data that has been collected by staff.

ACTION: Biodiversity Group and Staff to have a meeting, which may include Parks and potentially the other working groups, in order to get ready regarding deadlines to Council for March/April.

Councillor Mersereau addressed the request for motion on the budget. Councillor Mersereau stated that she does not believe a motion is necessary at this time as there is already a healthy budget for Resilience Saanich at this stage that has been approved by Council. We may need this budget motion in Milestone 3 where we are exceeding this preapproved budget.

The Stewardship Group provided an update

The Stewardship group suggested that the discussion, in the interest of time, be opened up to questions but noted that the Group's preliminary conversation was fairly wide ranging and they are looking forward to refining our thinking as we move forward.

Questions were posed by Committee members to the Stewardship Working Group

1. One aspect of the Stewardship that was not seen in the plan is the encouragement of people to plant things in their back yard to increase biodiversity. To not have just a lawn. Will this be part of the plan?

It was noted:

- The committee can continue to pursue this if you think there is a gap there. One way to do this would be the plant salvaging opportunities that Saanich has. An example of this would be if there was an area that was going to be development and plants would be destroyed then people could have to the opportunity to go and salvage them. These opportunities are sometimes underutilized and maybe something to think about in terms of making this more available to individuals and larger groups as well. Could be a good education outreach program around print materials – access to resources.
 - Stewardship as a theme –all the groups will be thinking about Stewardship as a component to what we all do, which leads to an organizational issue around making this work.
 - Stewardship is not only necessarily as a volunteer. We may be putting policy/regulations that is based on Stewardship principals.
 - Hoping First Nations Stewardship connection will be a big part of this.
2. Development Permit Area Requirements for Natural Areas needs strengthening and improvement.
 - Protected fencing around trees. We have to look at what is being protected and reevaluate where the fencing needs to go – trunks or roots, etc.

- Covenant policies – Have access to look covenanted areas once per year to make sure it is protected as intended. A yearly check in that the owner is aware. Not a punitive policy but a check in.
- Tree replanting policies. A lot of opportunities with the development community to make some changes. Less trees but more trees that will do well in that particular area. Or some of the required trees go in to parks instead of on the development site.
- Remuneration for plant salvages. A tree that the average person is not able to move but that a development community can.

It was noted:

- When we were going through the EDPA process there was emphasis on the Restoration – concern that covenant is imposed on people who don't have technical background or interest to be able to maintain these areas. What is the work around for this.
 - Also is Stewardship that is required really Stewardship. Can it be a slower process where people are brought in to the fold through education and therefore impassioned and do it on their own rather than being forced to do it.
 - Saanich Parks has come a long way in its policy for Tree fencing and it is much better than it was before.
 - Projects that get approved in part because applicant has agreed to a Covenant should be a bit closer monitored and followed up on.
3. What examples are there with respect to private land owner incentive?
- NAPTAP Covenant - on private land, by enrolling in the program you put a covenant on a part of a piece of property and would not pay property taxes on that part. This encourages people to protect this area. Maybe this could be seen as more a land protection strategy rather than a Stewardship Strategy.
 - There are also opportunities for other land owner incentives.
 - Subsidizing land owner incentive who are providing a community benefit through natural area stewardship protection is something the group is interested in exploring.

Gap Analysis Approach.

It was noted:

- Feel that each theme has to look at the Gap Analysis specifically what policies and the work that was done.
- Working together.
- Stewardship between different pieces.
- Evaluations matrix.
- Can't really do this until we have an inventory of what we have and don't have.

Marine Shorelines

- From an inventory perspective what do we have/not have and what are the gaps.
- Threats – community impact of shoreline hardening. Again we need the data before we can really know.
- Shorelines may be a bit easier to do as there really isn't a lot therefore there are a lot of gaps.
- Not doing a gap analysis but rather an outline and our challenge is to integrate this.
- Reinforce the idea the Gap Analysis has to include State of the Environment and also to occur at the level of each thematic plan.

What does 2021 look like for each Committee group

- 1) Biodiversity – have to add policy and Legislation to our definition that benefits biodiversity or doesn't to our Gap Analysis. Brainstorm what the policies should be and then look at what is covered and what isn't. Still thinking about a strategy and developing the outlines. Future working groups for other thematic plans and trying to do this at a manageable pace. Perhaps reviewing one of the thematic plans that Saanich already has, such as the Environmental section of the Climate Plan, and maybe this becomes the work of the first quarter for the year. Urban Forestry Plan could also be reviewed at some point.

Question to Biodiversity Group – we have lots of different environments – highly built, cultivated, natural, etc. From a biodiversity point of view, what should be looked at next, the ones that are not necessarily natural areas.

It was noted:

- No area is out of our biodiversity goals. Every area can have some contribution to biodiversity. Don't give up on any area as out of bounds.
- Some areas due to human use may be a challenge but we shouldn't give up on any area that is too built up.

Summary of the Engagement Plan

Adriane Pollard, Manager of Environmental Services gives a brief Summary of the Engagement Plan.

- Only for draft goals and objectives review. Focus is on general public and targeted stakeholders.
- Electronic and printed material in terms of promotion due for COVID.
- For general public the main tools are to get people to the feedback form and email address. Virtual open house, handouts that talks about goals and objectives (English, Punjabi and Chinese) and feedback form. Social media, Our Backyard, newsletter, community posters, promo cards – which will direct them to e-bulletins and email addresses; extensive email lists and we are doing a bulk mail out to Saanich residents.
- For Targeted Stakeholders we will use existing contacts we have, virtual meetings, school programs, youth programs, presentations, interviews, senior centres. Working with Sustainability and Recreation to create an actual youth program where youth will be able to sign up to learn and give feedback on Environment and Sustainability issues. This program will be delivered through recreation.
- Expecting all this to launch by the end of the week. If you any ideas that are not seen in the plan please contact: Thomas Munson, your contact person. Please keep telling us your ideas down the road because we will be adapting as we go as we hear from people. Materials are available to you tonight.

- 1) Are the Goals and Objectives the last version of goals and objectives that were circulated? Did they go to Council and have they been approved?

Yes, it was the version that the chair sent you New Year's Eve. Once this information is publicly released and feedback has occurred, adjustments can be made. When we go to Council for Milestone 1 we will go to Council with this information – Committee goals and objectives, and feedback from public.

- 2) Do you need all nine of us to be engaged and involved in the video process to meet Staff needs? And also, is the amount of goals and objectives enough for you to go out and do a comprehensive engagement outreach plan?

Purpose and objectives to having everyone participate was so that the public could put a face to a name (backgrounds, names, faces) and also to have a different way to learn about the draft goals and objectives. But no, not everyone has to participate. If the video is not coming we can look at doing something else. We can also promote the video down the road as well if everyone decides they would like to be involved.

- 3) Will there be a big context piece that accompanies the draft?

We have included the proposed vision, principles, goals and objectives not just the goals and objectives. This addition, regarding principles, will round it out well. When we go out we try not to overwhelm the public with so much that they lose interest. There are lots of links embedded in the material so that the public can link over to more information if they choose. The basics are: here is the committee, here is what we purpose, what would you add if you could add something. Context is given to the goals and objectives, which are given as verbatim, but not necessarily the context as verbatim. Staff have put the material in the Saanich Corporate format.

- 4) Can we see the package before it goes out to the public? In order to understand the feedback and how the data will come back to us.

Some things have been prepared already, the main piece being the two pager on the goals and objectives. Everything is 95 percent is ready except the two page document so we can sent that out for those who aren't attending in person.

ACTION: A. Pollard to send out documents as soon as they are ready.

- 5) Clarification on the video.

Please send in video segments if you would like to be in the video. The committee members who worked on the goals and objectives piece could work on the video. Staff have put together a brief outline of what is expected in the video in the google docs.

- 6) Stakeholders – are these four stakeholders included on your list on the list from terms of reference: qualified professionals, NGOs, Staff from different Departments, and the Development and Design Community. And do you feel that this is the stage in which they need to be engaged or further down the road.

We include development industry, consulting biologist, staff were taken off the list but will be consulted in the regular processes within Saanich; and Community Stewardship groups and Associations and NGO.

WORK PLAN - RSTC Actions for Milestone 1. How can these be used to be more efficient.

- 1) How do we address the things that are in the draft. How will we meet our goals and objectives.
- 2) Ten principles could serve as the first cut of the evaluation process.
- 3) Each working group has to formulate and then we can move around from one working group to another.
- 4) T. Munson is point person. Hours are Monday/Tuesday 8:30-4:30 and half day Wednesday.

6. WRAP UP

Motion: **MOVED** by T. Stevens and **Seconded** by J. Gye: “That the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee adjourn.”

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

NEXT MEETING

February 16, 2021.

Stewart Guy, Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are accurate.

Committee Secretary

Public Correspondence for the Resilient Saanich Technical Committee

Item 4

(Received from November 16, 2020 to February 7, 2021)

The following emails were received at biodiversity@saanich.ca (or directly to staff) and deal specifically with the work of the RSTC.

Date Received	From
Feb 7, 2021	Dave F
Feb 7, 2021	Sania Poluch
Feb 6, 2021	Sharon Wetselaar
Feb 5, 2021	Sean Murray
Feb 5, 2021	Claudia Copley
Feb 5, 2021	Angelique Kambeitz
Feb 4, 2021	Rosa Schuh
Feb 4, 2021	Robert Reimer
Feb 3, 2021	Andrew
Feb 3, 2021	Ter Wen
Dec 2, 2021	Art Bickerton

Lynn Merry

From: Mick Collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 1:17 PM
To: Thomas Munson
Cc: [REDACTED] Adriane Pollard
Subject: (External Email) input to new Saanich Environmental committee

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Hi Thomas,
Congratulations on establishing such a talented group. I just wanted to share a couple of quick ideas as input .

As you know, we have been working on Elk/Beaver Lake and its watershed intensively since 2014. For the last 2 years a similar effort has gone into the Colquitz River watershed as a whole through the Portage Inlet Cutthroat Initiative(PICI), which I co-manage as a volunteer with Yogi Carolsfeld, World Fisheries Trust.

Saanich has a pretty good track record with the creation of linear parks along sections of the Colquitz and excellent cooperation with Peninsula Streams on restoration. Through PICI we have gained a substantial body of information particularly about waterflow and water quality measurements/ monitoring systems. As you develop your committee work plan, we would certainly appreciate a specific focus (subcommittee?)on the following topics, which are of course all interlinked:

- 1/ stormwater management(UVIC Environmental Law Centre as you know has done 2 major reports on this topic in the CRD). Particularly possibilities of joint initiatives with BC Government MOTI to reduce impacts, particularly on the first fall flush
- 2/ review of effectiveness of riparian zone setbacks on agricultural and other land use zones in reducing pollutants/sedimentation
- 3/ building in more green measures for all future development
- 4/ opportunities for further conservation and protection of all streams/tributaries/ wetlands and opportunities for water storage to augment low summer stream flows(any possibilities for additions to linear parks on water courses?)

I am sure there are other elements. Having been involved a number of years now, I would be happy to speak to you or any of your committee members to provide further details which maybe of assistance, particularly in the area of robust water flow and quality monitoring and the health of fish populations which are a good indicator of overall environmental health.

Best wishes for a most productive outcome to your very important work

Mick Collins
Conservation director, Victoria Golden Rods and Reels Fishing and Social Club www.goldenrodsandreels.com [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Megan MacDonald

From: arthurbick [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 08, 2020 2:36 PM
To: Council
Subject: (External Email) Resubmitted -Questions On Biodiversity Plan

POST TO	Ref	POSTED
COPY TO		SH
INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	
REPLY TO WRITER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	- SH
COPY RESPONSE TO LEGISLATIVE DIVISION		
REPORT	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FOR		
ACKNOWLEDGED	A/E	

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Hello Mayor and Council:

I agree with a Biodiversity plan that will protect all the rare earth land above and below Saanich Parks. It must be compassionate, all inclusive and comprehensive. It must have written approval of the 13 other municipalities if it is to be a continuous link. Saanich should be requesting Federal/Provincial infrastructure funding so that the EDPA bylaws and biodiversity plans do not overburden the taxpayers. It must not become divisive and polarize the community.

We are witnessing changes from Climate Change, public attitudes/skepticism, Jobs/economic uncertainty and interference from foreign governments.

Here are some questions regarding the Biodiversity Plan:

Will it be based on compassionate private stewardship that includes all Saanich and CRD parks?

Will persons who file environmental bylaw complaints be required to volunteer and assist in eco-sensitive restoration?

Will bylaws be strictly enforced to remove illegal campers? (The Rights for public safety, park employees and Fire Responders must be guaranteed) Will Fire Safety Zones take precedence over environmental bylaws to avoid Saanich liability and lawsuits?

Will more funding be provided to prevent erosion, flooding, continued invasive species removal, Garbage dumping enforcement, derelict boat removal, domestic/wildlife control, washed-up foreign contamination, groundwater protection and blue-green algae prevention?

Will a Biodiversity audit be posted biannually to explain the costs and objectives achieved?

Will there be a moratorium on building on flood plains or nearby wetlands?

Will Saanich create an agreement to measure quantity and quality of well-water?

Will there be an ongoing procedures to prevent possible bio-Terrorism threats to our eco-sensitive environments, agriculture, drinking water and wastewater facilities?

Will funds be set aside to assist low income families and seniors with land remediation?

Will Saanich allow and support the film industry if filming is requested in our Parks with the money going only toward maintenance of parks?

Will there be on going measurements taken to calculate the loss of water to the water-table due to rising temperatures?

With the occurrence of sea level rise, is Saanich preparing to shore-up park coastlines to prevent further erosion?

Has Saanich consulted with B.C. Hydro to shut off hydro power to lines that are close to rural parks with a biodiversity link, in case of wildfire?

Has Saanich any preventative alerts to protect residents who might become the target of scam artists using a bio-diversity ploy?

Will there be a compassionate hotline where the public can report transient campers contaminating eco-sensitive land and have them immediately removed?

If the pandemic continues and bankruptcies increase, will Saanich postpone further biodiversity implementation?

RECEIVED

By M. MacDonald, Legislative Serv., District of Saanich at 12:15 pm, Aug 10, 2020

I hope Council will consider these questions toward compassionate stewardship of private property land and include Saanich/CRD Parks within the biodiversity plan.

Thank you. Art Bickerton

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Resilient Saanich - Biodiversity

-----Original Message-----

From: ROSA SCHUH [REDACTED]
Sent: February-04-21 3:54 PM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Resilient Saanich - Biodiversity

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Hello all,
Feb 4, 2020, and although I m not biking anywhere today - I usually ride from the Saanich Municipal Hall to downtown Victoria via the "Goose".
There are several tunnels along the way. Lovely infrastructure. Unfortunately graffiti finds its way into these. Here is my suggestion: instead of the city painting grey over it incessantly just "let it be" !
Gallons of paint, hours of labour, waste of water and brushes, etc.

JUST LET IT BE —Or commission it and let someone feel proud they have been part of the community;
Biodiversity or the Resilient Saanich Environmental Policy Framework !

Kind Regards
Rosa Schuh
[REDACTED]

PS Many examples around the world in the poorer communities and slums.

Sent from my iPhone

Lynn Merry

To: Adriane Pollard
Subject: RE: (External Email) publication of The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review

From: Copley, Claudia [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2021 5:36 AM
To: Adriane Pollard <Adriane.Pollard@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) publication of The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Something for the Resilient Saanich Committee?

Claudia Copley (she/her) Collection Manager and Researcher, Entomology | Collections Care and Conservation

ROYAL BC MUSEUM

Traditional Territory of the Lekwungen (Songhees and Xwsepsum Nations)
675 Belleville Street, Victoria, BC Canada V8W 9W2

[REDACTED] royalbcmuseum.bc.ca

Join us on: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Flickr](#) | [Instagram](#)

Dive deep into the stories and science that surround the magnificent orca, spirit of BC's wild coast and apex predator of all oceans. Our next feature exhibition, [Orcas: Our Shared Future](#), premieres April 16, 2021, at the Royal BC Museum.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/final-report-the-economics-of-biodiversity-the-dasgupta-review>

The Dasgupta Review is an independent, global review on the Economics of Biodiversity led by Professor Sir Partha Dasgupta (Frank Ramsey Professor Emeritus, University of Cambridge). The Review was commissioned in 2019 by HM Treasury and has been supported by an Advisory Panel drawn from public policy, science, economics, finance and business.

The Review calls for changes in how we think, act and measure economic success to protect and enhance our prosperity and the natural world. Grounded in a deep understanding of ecosystem processes and how they are affected by economic activity, the new framework

presented by the Review sets out how we should account for Nature in economics and decision-making.

The final Review comprises the Full Report, an Abridged Version and the Headline Messages. Final Report documents (above).

Press Notice including external reactions to the Review:

- [The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review – Press Notice](#)
- The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review – Reactions (document above)

General enquiries and feedback should be directed to the Independent Review team biodiversityreview@hmtreasury.gov.uk

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Individual yards

-----Original Message-----

From: Sharon Wetselaar [REDACTED]
Sent: February-06-21 12:00 PM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Individual yards

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Hi folks.

Just beginning to wade through the info on your website and really pleased that Saanich is keen to develop a healthy biodiversity policy. I'm wondering how specific it will be for individual households?

Our lot is 85'x110', and has an oldish house on it (built in 1921) and 9 fruit/nut trees on it, 5 of which are nearing 100 years old. Big grape vines that still produce fruit, as well. Over the years, with the help of LifeCycles to prune and pick, we have maintained these plants. Hundreds of pounds of fruit has gone to food kitchens and food banks each year. And there has still been enough left over for us and the deer and raccoons and squirrels and birds to enjoy!

We also have lots of hedges and shrubs (and lawn) to water and maintain. Not complaining - it's all worth it to provide a green oasis for the creatures (human and otherwise) that hang out here. Good for the soul, good for the body, good for the planet!

Sadly, however, we watch the properties on our block - and neighborhood - shrinking in size and increasing in density. Trees and greenery being replaced by stone and parking spaces. Our property is becoming one of the last places around here where birds and small creatures still hang out on a regular basis. (It troubles us, though, to look over the growing list of birds that no longer come to our yard anymore.)

I understand that things change, and we must change with it. House prices are horrendous, most folks are so busy working that they have no time for big gardens anymore, our life styles are different, what we want out of life has changed, etc. etc.

And it IS increasingly expensive to maintain a large garden/yard, especially when we reach the point in life where we are no longer young and fit, and must rely on professional help for pruning, lawn cutting, and hedge and yard maintenance. Not to mention the rising cost of water to keep everything growing.

We do want to stay in this place as long as we can, and keep it as a little green space. And be good stewards of what we've been given. However, I'm sure it's only a matter of time before rising costs, our advancing age and deteriorating health will force us to give up that dream....

I'm wondering if there is going to be any space in your idea of biodiversity for encouraging/saving/perpetuating urban gardens such as ours. How can we keep some of these green spaces out of the hands of "developers?" Should we keep them out of their hands? Could there be tax incentives for people who wish to keep their urban gardens as green spaces for the good of all? (Including climate and the planet!) Or.....?

Just thinking out loud....☐

Sharon Wetselaar

Sent from my iPad

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Has anyone created a list of planted native trees on iNaturalist?

-----Original Message-----

From: Angelique [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2021 11:51 AM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Has anyone created a list of planted native trees on iNaturalist?

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Hello, I have a few questions about the 'Resilient Saanich' initiative:

- 1) Are native Vancouver Island plants the only plants that Saanich Parks will use under the 'Resilient Saanich' initiative?
- 2) Has anyone started a project on iNaturalist which includes a photo of the native plant planted under this initiative, date planted, and any notes on watering times, concurrent native species, and susceptibility to European rabbits and Columbian Black Tailed deer foraging, and possible invasive species danger - eg. could death cap (*Amanita phalloides*) spores be hiding in the roots of the planted species - which has been seen where tree imports from Eastern North America have brought them in?
- 3) Are any dog-free parks and beaches included in the plan, to protect pockets of rare, endangered plants and bird populations in our parks?

Thanks for reading :)

Angelique Kambeitz

Sent from my iPad

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Feedback re: conservation strategy, stewardship and climate plan

From: Ter Wen [REDACTED]
Sent: February-03-21 3:50 PM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Feedback re: conservation strategy, stewardship and climate plan

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

I support most of the initiatives that increase green space if they include saving trees and bushes and grass. Unfortunately, many of Saanich's new initiatives are opposite to their supposed climate plan.

Proposals to expand the width of streets such as shelbourne and cut down hundreds of old beautiful trees and replace with a few new trees is disrespectful to the existing tree life, in addition to it taking decades for these new trees to offer the green benefits in the air that the existing trees provide.

The legitimizing of carriage houses in backyards is the most anti-climate move I have ever seen!!! Saanich council and mayor should be ashamed of themselves. Neighbours on my street have torn down multiple trees, bushes and removed grass and other green space to put up these enormous buildings. (Neighbour removed over 20 trees, all of the bushes and grass to replace with additional buildings and gravel and Saanich approved this!)

Saanich climate change proposals do not take into consideration the impact of multiple cars on streets with no onsite parking being made available to accommodate the new allowance of 6 unrelated people per house! This shows lack of stewardship and disregard for the environment and climate.

This new environmental policy is a sham made to try to divert people's attention away from all of the destructive policies that Saanich mayor and council have passed these last 2 years.

Ter Wen
Saanich resident

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Environmental Policy Framework

From: Sania Poluch [REDACTED]
Sent: February-07-21 10:51 AM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Environmental Policy Framework

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/feb/05/malmo-sweden-success-rewild-london-aoe>

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Compostable plastic

From: Sean Murray [REDACTED]
Sent: February-05-21 8:40 PM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Compostable plastic

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Dear resilient Saanich,
I would like to see the more widespread use of compostable plastic, especially for one use items, such as the packaging that WalMart uses for salads etc. Can we as a municipality force the issue or is it something that requires Provincial or Federal Authority ? Please let's work on issues like this together.

from
Mr. Sean Murray
[REDACTED] Darwin ave.
Victoria B.C. (Saanich)
V8X 2X7 [REDACTED]

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) biodiversity generally

From: Robert Reimer [REDACTED]
Sent: February-04-21 8:45 AM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) biodiversity generally

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Re: Biodiversity in Saanich

Whilst we pursue biodiversity and healthy neighbourhoods, some practical matters get overlooked.

Of particular interest to me are trees and the problems they create – due mainly to poor decisions. In my work I encounter the results of bad decisions and their consequences.

For example, Western Red Cedars are great in Parks and near water courses. Small urban yards are not the place for those trees. I have been involved in litigation regarding Western Red Cedars. They want to be 150+ feet tall and grow rapidly. Their branches and roots encroach on adjoining property and cause damage to structures above and below ground. In the pursuit of biodiversity, we need to select trees that are appropriate to the area in which they are planted.

For what it is worth.

Bob

ROBERT A. REIMER, LAWYER
[REDACTED] SHELBOURNE STREET
VICTORIA, BC V8N 3E8
CANADA

[REDACTED]

Notice to clients:

The health and safety of our staff and clients is our top priority. We are actively monitoring the COVID-19 situation closely and following the recommendations of public health officials.

At this time our office remains open but are actively working to limit interactions between staff and clients for everyone's safety. Appointments that do not require in-person attendance will be conducted via telephone or videoconferencing.

Please do not attend our office if:

- you do not have a scheduled appointment;
- or if you have been out of the country in the past two weeks;
- or if you, or anyone in your social circle, is experiencing cold or flu-like symptoms;
- or if in the last two weeks you, or anyone in your social circle, has been in contact with someone who is experiencing cold or flu-like symptoms.

We are assessing the situation regularly and will promptly reassess and adapt our measures as required.

We thank you for your understanding and appreciate your patience and flexibility as we continue to monitor this situation. If you have any questions or concerns please contact our office. We wish everyone to remain safe and healthy through these challenging times.

Lynn Merry

To: biodiversity
Subject: RE: (External Email) Artificial Turf

From: Dave F [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 07, 2021 10:11 AM
To: biodiversity <biodiversity@saanich.ca>
Subject: (External Email) Artificial Turf

This email sent from outside the District of Saanich. Use caution if message is unexpected or sender is not known to you.

Does Artificial Turf come under the Resilient Saanich Environmental Policy Framework? (Pesticides, Weed Killers, Micro-plastics, Etc.)
If not Why not.
Thanks Dave

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Resilient Saanich Technical Committee - Staff Update – February 8, 2021

Item 5

Milestone One Deliverables	Progress Update
Create a webpage and subscribe-able bulletins to keep residents updated and engaged in the project, progress, and opportunities for involvement.	Complete. No changes other than to direct visitors to the virtual open house.
Draft a <i>Resilient Saanich framework skeleton</i> of existing policies, etc. Conduct a gap analysis. Identify options for filling gaps using the Green Bylaws Toolkit and other references.	2 nd draft complete.
Collate and analyze examples of, and guides for, municipal-scale biodiversity conservation strategies and stewardship programs for applicable models and lessons for Saanich.	Complete. Binders continue to be borrowed by RSTC members.
Summarize international, national, provincial, regional, and municipal targets for biological conservation .	Complete. No changes to date.
Publish the 4 th edition of the ESA Atlas .	2 nd draft completed and with the RSTC for review.
Establish the Technical Committee and, with staff: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. further refine the scope for the Environmental Policy Framework (EPF) and data collection 2. develop an evaluation matrix for the selection of policy tools 3. propose the project objectives 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In progress 2. In progress 3. Complete
Gain public feedback on the proposed project goals and objectives.	In progress until late February/ early March.
Hire a temporary GIS staff person.	Complete. Work towards action item 11 (Milestone 2) initiated.
Identify an enhancement to the stewardship program	In progress as previously reported.
Submit a progress report to Advisory Committees and Council including gaps in data and information considered important for the completion of the framework.	Due at the end of Q1

On December 8, 2020, the RSTC received a presentation from Saanich Environmental Services' Adriane Pollard about the new version of the Environmental Reference Atlas (ERA). This was accompanied by a deck of slides that we were all sent in advance. At the end of the presentation, we were invited to review the atlas and comment on the new version.

General comments

The value of providing mapping in a pdf atlas format is questionable in our opinion. It is time consuming and costly to update this kind of information and, as a result, old, outdated information such as the existing marine inventory persists. In addition, it is not possible to customize the available information for optimal viewing or analysis. Tablets are widely available for field staff to use on line mapping efficiently and effectively.

We have found the mapping of a mix of three different inventory systems on the atlas to be confusing, particularly where there are overlaps among them. A few examples:

Map 39 in Atlas - 4748 Spring Road – CDF TEM layer says YF – young forest, SEI layer says WD – woodland for the same area. Which is it?

Map 28 in Atlas – Mount Douglas Park – SEI says OF – older forest, CDF TEM layer says YF – young forest on the same area.

Map 20 Brodick Park – SEI layer says WD – woodland - while CDF TEM layer says YF – young forest

There are many of these discrepancies, but these three make the point. We think it can be seen how confusing that is, and to a lay person trying to figure out the Atlas/GIS maps, quite difficult.

GIS and Atlas Accuracy

We have some concerns about the accuracy of designation of ESAs, or Environmental Sensitive or Significant areas as marked on the maps. Three inventory methods were used, resulting in three different GIS layers, which can be seen on the Saanich GIS map. They are brought together and combined in the ERA Atlas. Accuracy is important. In order to build a biodiversity strategy, we need a precise understanding of (a) where actual environmentally significant areas are located, and (b) what is in these areas. We also need this information for Saanich parks. Most smaller parks and areas within the parks with smaller ecosystems, such as Trembling Aspen Woodland, are not mapped. Ecological condition is not noted by any of the three mapping systems.

It is difficult to reconcile the statement in the accompanying memo (ap_introduutory text_2020): *“To be included in the Atlas, data must be from a comprehensive environmental inventory using technical and consistent standards”* with slide 8 of the power point presentation, showing a low percentage of field checked sites, especially the TEM polygons. We are concerned about how many of the mapped polygons meet that bar. For the SEI and SEM mapping, the technical standards are either the Ecosystems at Risk or the SEI standards. In the case of the phase 3 Grau SEM mapping, none of the over 100 polygons were subject to comprehensive environmental inventory, or even a site visit, yet they are in the Atlas. Surely these are “iffy” polygons, at best. The concern is that the public will read the maps as though these are facts, and will be thereby mis-led. We see no place in the Atlas where the appropriate context is given.

One aspect that would create more confidence in the accuracy of the ESA designations would be to know that there was a lot of field verification. On Slide 8, what does “verified” actually mean? Does it mean 45% of SEM sites were visited and confirmed to be accurate? If not that, then what is involved in verifying a site? Again, this is a matter of having confidence in the designations on the maps.

There is general agreement that lawns and flower gardens under trees are usually not ESAs. In addition, areas in poor or fair ecological condition, which are dominated by invasive species, would likely not meet this bar. If there is disagreement on that, it’s a point of discussion for the RSTC. Even if not in an ESA, a property owner could agree to voluntary enhancements to add to biodiversity.

In terms of the SEI inventory methods, ecosystem fragments must be “relatively unmodified” in order to meet the SEI criteria¹. From the mapping perspective, there are ESA polygons on the maps that consist of lawns and gardens under trees.² In most cases we suspect these are in fact very modified. So, are they correctly identified on the maps? Or are they assumed to be ESAs because there are trees on the site, but no information on what’s under the trees? There are also many examples of lawns and gardens under trees that are not mapped as ESAs. In terms of a gap analysis, there may be a sizeable gap between what the mapping shows as the number of potential ESAs and the number of actual ESAs on the landscape if the SEI methods are used consistently. Discrepancies are a source of concern, again, about the reliability of the information being presented to the public.

We believe that the RSTC needs to take a much more critical, technical look at the mapping, especially the SEI and Saanich Ecosystem Mapping (SEM), which uses a “modified” SEI inventory method. In slide 11 of the presentation, it indicates that the SEI follows the Ecosystems at Risk standard, but it is still not clear what all the modifications were made to the SEI method in arriving at a modified method for the SEM. Without that clarity, can we have confidence that it’s consistent with SEI, and not identifying “apples and pears” as Stewart put it at the meeting?

The TEM map layer is included on the atlas, and there is a separate layer for TEM mapping on the Saanich GIS map. TEM has up to three ecosystem components in each polygon, yet only one is reported. The TEM layer on the GIS could contain more information on vegetation associations within each polygon. And there is evidence that some polygons are incorrectly identified, as we would expect since a

¹ **From Sensitive Ecosystems Inventory: East Vancouver Island and Gulf Islands 1993-1997. Volume 1: Methodology, Ecological Descriptions and Results:**

The primary objective of the SEI project was to systematically identify, classify, and map terrestrial ecosystems and other habitats of high biodiversity which remain relatively unmodified, on eastern Vancouver Island and the adjacent Gulf Islands (Page 1).

² Map 7 – Camosun College – large area of lawn under oak trees, native plant garden is covered in invasive and agronomic grasses; Map 10 – Kathleen Street-Rock Street - lawn, garden, invasives; Map 17 – Zinnia Court – ROW mapped as Woodland, but covered in invasive species – ivy, blackberry; Lavender Avenue, Montcalm Street – mapped as Woodland when they are lawn, garden, roadway, pathways, invasives and a few native species under oak trees; Map 19 – San Marino – front yards – lawn and garden under oak trees – a few native species; Cumberland Street – dominated by invasive species; Map 26 - 4140 Quadra Street is lawn and garden under oak trees, etc.

very small number were field checked.³ At the scale of 1:20,000, the TEM maps may be too large for assessing individual properties, or small but important ecosystem fragments in parks.

There is also a concern about mapping the natural state covenant areas. These are characterized as protected areas when in many instances this is not the case. Many covenants have been overwhelmed with non-native vegetation and are now, in effect, weed patches of questionable environmental value. This must be a concern to RSTC if a meaningful biodiversity strategy is to be developed, because in principle, the natural state covenants serve to enhance local biodiversity. However, they are not doing so if they become overwhelmed by invasive plants, and the native biodiversity is much reduced.

Recommendation: The RSTC considers forming a working group to look at concerns identified around ESA mapping, including:

- RSTC or a consultant conduct a technical peer review of the methods used to produce the SEI mapping and processes of site verification.
- Confirm if the modifications to the SEM inventory meet the SEI standards, which also meets the Ecosystems at Risk Standard.
- An independent consultant undertakes an audit of a representative sample of ESA polygons in the atlas inside the Urban Containment Boundary, following the Ecosystems at Risk or SEI standards, to confirm the accuracy of the designations.
- Where mapping appears to incorrectly identify an ESA, discuss if the onus is on the property owner or Saanich to do the initial confirmation.

Coastal Mapping

Saanich On Line Map

SEI Mapping of “Coastal Bluffs”. In the US PNW and BC, coastal bluffs are generally defined as sediment embankments (clay/silt, sand, pebble/cobble), subject to erosional processes, that can be important sources of sediment to adjacent beaches (these bluffs are often referred to as feeder bluffs)⁴. Rock cliffs and rock ramps are non-erosional and are not considered to be coastal bluffs, although they may be defined as such by some jurisdictions. Sedimentary coastal bluffs are indeed sensitive ecosystem components; they erode, feed beaches and houses perched on top can be at risk. Rock cliffs are far less sensitive, being resistant to erosion and not highly sensitive to sea level rise (SLR), although rare or sensitive terrestrial plant communities may be present at the top of these rock cliffs and ramps. Many of the shores identified as coastal bluffs in the SEI mapping are actually rock cliffs or ramps (e.g. Ten

³ For example, a small TEM polygon on the east side of Mt. Douglas Park is marked as WD – woodland. But the info descriptors say it's 100% *Cladina-Wallace's selaginella* plant community. These are a lichen and a clubmoss, both ground flora. So why is this polygon marked as woodland? Another example is near Playfair Park, at 1140 and 1180 Rock St. The TEM map shows this as 90% young forest Garry oak woodland. But these are residential lots with large oak trees over lawn. Not a young forest, or a forest. So far, several examples like this have been encountered. It calls into question the usefulness of the maps.

⁴ A bluff is defined as a steep shoreline slope formed in sediment (loose material such as clay, sand, and gravel) that has three feet or more of vertical elevation just above the high tide line. Cliffs or slopes in bedrock (ledge) surfaces are not bluffs and are not subject to significant erosion in a century or more. Beaches and dunes do not form bluffs, except along the seaward dune edge as a result of erosion (Maine Geological Survey).

Mile Point to Gencoe Cove). The SEI mapping does not show a number of key sensitive coastal bluffs in Saanich (e.g. Mt Doug Park and bluff to the south).

Recommendation This layer should be re-evaluated and only sedimentary coastal bluffs shown as bluffs. Rock cliffs and ramps do not need to be shown as “Sensitive ecosystem components” but see below re comments on the need to provide more comprehensive coastal mapping.

Other Coastal SEI components – Users should not be left with the idea that coastal bluffs are the only sensitive ecosystem components of shorelines. Low lying areas, many containing important salt marsh habitat, are highly sensitive to sea level rise and storm surge. Beaches and tidal channels can be vulnerable to erosion generally but particularly in a rising sea level scenario. These areas may be shown on flood control mapping but, for completeness, should also be identified as SEI components. Map 3 in the Thetis Island coastal mapping link provided below shows a number of sensitive coastal ecosystem components addressed by this Islands Trust mapping initiative.

Recommendation – Consider defining and mapping additional sensitive ecosystem components on the on-line mapping system

Legends and Symbolology As you zoom in the symbol for each identified polygon unit quite nicely, on a right click, you can get detailed information on the polygon in a drop down. However, unless you are familiar with SEI terminology you can’t easily find out the SG = Second Growth. It would be nice if, in each drop down, both the SEI term (e.g. SG) and the actual words (Second Growth) appears, as there is no border legend for these symbols.

Orthophoto Base Maps – The time series of orthophoto base maps grows more useful with each added layer. Years ago, Saanich was encouraged to fly the coastal component of the District on as low a tide as possible given the constraints of weather, time of low tide and sun angle. Not sure if that was done – most years look like mid tide. Saanich should attempt to fly the coastal areas on as low a tide as possible as a time series of good low tide imagery is extremely useful at both a site and regional level.

Environmental Reference Atlas

Marine Inventory Component

Age of Existing Data. There is a concern that the 2020 edition of the atlas uses 20 to 25 year old data for the marine coastline. Much has changed over the past couple of decades, especially in the coastal riparian zone, and these data are potentially misleading. Clearly there is a need to redo the coastal inventory data, likely in a more systematic format than was done previously (see below). Any new inventory mapping should be uploaded to the Online map, so it is questionable whether these old data should be re-published in the new atlas unless Saanich is prepared to update it in the near future.

Difficulty Interpreting the Mapped Coastal Information. The Marine Inventory shows 3 general feature areas; Marine Feature Area, Marine Backshore Area and Marine Biodiversity Area. Most specific areas have an identifier (e.g. G4-NNB) however there is no key to these identifiers in the atlas (at least that can be easily found). Without knowing more specific information on the identified feature, the mapped information is of limited value to the user. This could be addressed on-line with a pop-up menu but likely that should be reserved for an updated data set.

Need for Comprehensive Shoreline Mapping by Shore Type. Unfortunately there is no standardized classification of shore types that is used nationally or internationally. In BC the Shore Zone mapping system, based on aerial videography, is used to map shore types susceptible to oil spills. The most recent mapping of Saanich shoreline (with the exception of the Gorge) was in 2004 (<https://mcori.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Viewer/index.html?appid=c76377500f814914ad90149f229d4d66>) About 10 years ago Islands Trust adapted the Shore Zone mapping system to provide a more simplified mapping of Trust Area shorelines that is easily understood by the public (<http://www.islandstrust.bc.ca/media/168688/thetisshorelinemapping.pdf>). More recently CRD has looked at using air photos and possibly drone imagery and spectral analysis, coupled with ground truth surveys, to map of intertidal and coastal riparian features in order to update the old VEHEAP mapping of intertidal and coastal riparian features in Victoria and Esquimalt Harbors as well as the Gorge.

Recommendation – Saanich should update the marine inventory database and mapping and include this updated information in the online mapping tool as well as an updated version of the Environmental Atlas. Saanich should consult with CRD to assess the feasibility and value of expanding the geographic area of the intertidal mapping planned for Victoria Harbour and the Gorge to include all of the District's shoreline.

February 1, 2021

Resilient Saanich Technical 2021 Work plan DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Item 8

** Denotes tasks that are identified in the Terms of Reference for the RSTC; others have been identified as areas of interest by the RSTC*

No.	Task description	Deliverable(s)	Timeline	Roles		
				Staff	RSTC	Council
1	Develop an evaluation matrix to guide selection of policy tools*	A. List of criteria /principles	Feb, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide administrative process support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft & finalize criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve in principle (with or separate from biodiversity strategy, as appropriate)
2	Set the EPF scope and identify data gaps*	B. Statements of what is in/out of scope for the EPF C. List of data gaps	Sept, 2021 (B & C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate RSTC review of existing data availability Provide administrative process support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft scope statements for the EPF Identify gaps and limitations in existing data and information to characterize and monitor natural assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve in principle Consider resource requests for additional studies/data gathering
3	Create a 'state of biodiversity report'	D. RFP E. State of Biodiversity Report	Sept, 2021 (D) July, 2021 (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft an RFP/Charter/ ToR based on input from the RSTC Facilitate staff and council reviews of the RFP/Charter/ToR as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set terms for the report by providing input and reviewing drafts of the RFP/Charter/ToR) Review and provide input on the proposed methodologies and the draft report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve the final report Consider resource requests if project costs exceed the allocated budget of \$250,000
4	Create a biodiversity strategy*	RFP Biodiversity Strategy	Nov, 2021 Dec, 2022 (Biodiversity Strategy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft an RFP/Charter/ ToR based on input from the RSTC Facilitate staff and council reviews of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set terms for the report and study by providing input and reviewing drafts of the RFP/Charter/ToR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve the final strategy Consider resource requests if project costs exceed the allocated budget of \$250,000

				the RFP/Charter/ToR as appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the work by reviewing the methodologies and the draft products 	
5	Review existing stewardship programs/activities and recommend improvements	Recommendations to improve stewardship on private and public lands	Dec, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate RSTC review of existing programs/activities • Review draft recommendations • Consider the feasibility of implementing final recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make recommendations to staff and Council to address gaps and opportunities to improve existing Saanich stewardship programs and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider all recommendations and provide direction to staff on implementation
6	Review existing programs/activities approaches to improve protection of marine backshore areas	Recommendations to improve protection of marine backshore areas	Dec, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate RSTC review of existing programs/activities • Review draft recommendations • Consider the feasibility of implementing final recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make recommendations to staff and Council address gaps and opportunities to improve existing Saanich programs and activities to protect marine backshore areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider all recommendations and provide direction to staff on implementation
7	Identify program areas to review in 2022	Draft 2022 work plan	Dec, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the RSTC in prioritizing program areas to focus on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify program areas to focus on in 2022 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive the 2022 work plan for information with a Resilient Saanich status update