

# Municipality of North Cowichan Environmental Advisory Committee AGENDA

Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 1:30 p.m.  
Electronically

Pages

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

This meeting, though electronic, is open to the public and all representations to the Environmental Advisory Committee form part of the public record. At this time, due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, public access to meeting rooms at North Cowichan Municipal Hall is not permitted, however, this meeting may be viewed on the District's live stream webcast at [www.northcowichan.ca/meetings](http://www.northcowichan.ca/meetings).

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Recommendation:

That the Committee approve the agenda as circulated [or as amended].

**3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

3 - 4

Recommendation:

That the Committee adopt the minutes of the meeting held February 16, 2021.

**4. BUSINESS**

**4.1. Presentation by the Corporate Officer regarding legislation affected through use of group emails**

Purpose: Michelle Martineau, Corporate Officer, will make an oral presentation of the impacts that using group emails has on decision making by Council.

**4.2. Presentation by Sandy McPherson and Cam Campbell**

Purpose: To provide a 20 minute presentation on the background to the 2013 CAEP document. [Presentation is tentative based on staff's review of materials]

**4.3. Clarification of questions from February 16, 2021 EAC meeting**

5 - 7

A document containing clarification of questions from the February 16, 2021 EAC meeting is provided for information.

**4.4. Continuation of review of CAEP actions and priorities**

Purpose: To provide Council with feedback on the action items and suggest priorities to aid in the development of the final plan of the Climate Action and Energy Plan update.

Recommendation:

That the Environmental Advisory Committee recommend that Council accept the climate modelling and action items prepared by SSG on February 2, 2021 with the inclusion of the following additional considerations:

- 

Alternative Recommendation #1:

That the Environmental Advisory Committee recommend to Council that the following actions be taken prior to finalizing the Climate Action and Energy Plan update:

- 

Alternative Recommendation #2:

That the Environmental Advisory Committee receive the climate modelling and action items prepared by SSG on \_\_\_\_\_ for information.

5. **NEW BUSINESS**
6. **ADJOURNMENT**

# Municipality of North Cowichan Environmental Advisory Committee MINUTES

February 16, 2021, 1:30 p.m.  
Electronically

Members Present	Councillor Kate Marsh, Chair Neil Anderson Cam Campbell Bruce Coates David Coulson Per Dahlstrom Sandra McPherson Ashley Muckle Dr. Jesse Patterson Dr. Geoffrey Strong Dr. Shannon Waters
Members Absent	Dr. Jana Kotaska
Staff Present	David Conway, Director, Engineering Dave Preikshot, Senior Environmental Specialist Shaun Chadburn, Environmental Programs Coordinator Michelle Martineau, Manager, Legislative Services Tricia Mayea, Deputy Corporate Officer

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

There being a quorum present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved and seconded:

That the Committee approve the agenda as circulated.

CARRIED

## 3. BUSINESS

### 3.1 Introductions

Brief introductions were provided by committee members and staff.

### 3.2 Legislative Services - Meeting Procedure Overview

Michelle Martineau, Manager, Legislative Services provided an overview of meeting procedures.

### **3.3 Setting the 2021 Meeting Schedule**

It was moved and seconded:

That the Environmental Advisory Committee set the following meeting schedule for 2021:

- Tuesday, March 16 at 1:30 p.m.
- Tuesday, April 20, at 1:30 p.m.
- Tuesday, May 18 at 1:30 p.m.
- Tuesday, June 22 at 1:30 p.m.
- Thursday, September 23 at 1:30 p.m.
- Tuesday, November 16 at 1:30 p.m.

CARRIED

### **3.4 Climate Action and Energy Plan Update - Economic Modelling and Action List**

Neil Armstrong left the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Dr. Shannon Waters left the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Jeremy Murphy, Sustainability Solutions Group provided a presentation on the Climate Action and Energy Plan Update that included a project status update, economic modelling, a recap of emissions forecasts, actions, opportunities and measures, and answered questions of the committee. A copy of the presentation was included in the agenda.

The meeting recessed at 4:23 p.m. by unanimous consent and reconvened at 4:30 p.m.

IT WAS MOVED AND SECONDED:

That the meeting be extended to 5:00 p.m.

CARRIED

The committee agreed by unanimous consent that consideration of the 'Climate Action and Energy Plan Update - Economic Modelling and Action List' be postponed to a future meeting - to be determined through a Doodle Poll that will be circulated to the committee by the Corporate Officer.

## **4. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting ended at 5:05 p.m.

---

Certified by Recording Secretary

---

Signed by Chair

## CAEP Modelling Clarifications from Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting February 16, 2021

**Q1: Does the plan give any consideration for Eco industrial parks given industrial land is expensive and hard to find in the Cowichan Valley?**

*A: Council referred this concept to the EAC for their consideration and it will be put forward as an agenda item at a future meeting. Although it doesn't specifically appear in the prioritization survey it would fall under the industrial energy use and emissions category. This is the type of local knowledge and input that staff and consultants hope will be brought to their attention through the prioritization survey and other engagement activities on the project.*

**Q2: What is Sustainability Solutions Groups (SSG) level of confidence in delivery or effectiveness of the proposed actions?**

*A: This is not a question for the Consultant nor staff to answer completely. Many actions require decisions of Council and cooperation of federal, provincial, and industry leaders to succeed. The list of actions represents the Consultant's best assessment of opportunities but does not preclude others, nor technological and legislative changes that could add actions or make actions more attractive in the future. The implementation and monitoring plan will also include an assessment of co-benefits, timelines, responsibilities, reporting mechanisms, ongoing engagement activities and policy considerations that will be provided in the final draft document.*

**Q3: The update model relies heavily on EV uptake to achieve targets. How confident can we be in that objective?**

*A: In 2019, the Provincial Government adopted the Zero Emissions Vehicles Act which requires automakers to meet increasing annual levels of EV sales reaching 10% of new light-duty vehicle sales by 2025, 30% by 2030 and 100% by 2040. Modelling by automotive industry analysts suggests that price parity will occur between 2023 and 2030 and conservative forecasts of EV sales show them leading the majority global market share by 2040.*

*BC now has the highest number of EV's per capita in North America. Despite a slump in overall car sales due to Covid19, the number of EV's on the road in British Columbia doubled between 2019 and 2020.*

**Q4: There is little mention of the impact of location and form of development in the update model despite it being a key factor in reducing GHG's in the original CAEP. How is this apparent change rationalized?**

*A: The opinion of SSG is that modelling land use to any greater degree or detail will not provide any greater insight into likely changes in emissions or resulting actions. Staff will provide a basic overview of how land use is modeled and incorporated in the new model at the next meeting.*

**Q5: Does the new model consider embedded carbon emissions from the goods that residents purchase from other areas. How is it measured for North Cowichan?**

*A: Inventorying, monitoring and reporting on embedded carbon emissions would be very onerous to calculate/estimate and monitor over time. This is why the Global Protocol for Community GHG emissions advises that all cities follow the scope of emissions used in the CAEP update. This approach provides consistent and transparent measurement and reporting of GHG emissions globally. Although it may not always assign emissions to the end user, it captures embedded emissions at the production location, so this protocol encompasses all emissions at the international scale.*

**Q6: Is CO2 the only Greenhouse Gas considered in the modelling, or are others such as Methane incorporated into the model?**

*A: The CAEP update also estimates emissions from methane and nitrous oxide. In the Community emissions estimate for North Cowichan, carbon dioxide was ~85%, methane ~14% and Nitrous oxide ~1%. For methane, reuse is an aspect of emission reduction if it displaces other fossil fuel use.*

**Q7: The Property Assess Clean Energy (PACE) program should be an action.**

*A: PACE is a means to encourage home retrofits financed through taxes which stay with the home versus homeowner. This type of action falls within the “retrofit existing buildings” category. According to PACE BC, these types of programs are still awaiting legislative changes to enable their use in BC. Similar to the Better Homes BC program, these types of programs are significantly more effective and efficient when higher levels of governments endorse, promote and cover some, or all, of the administrative aspects of them. It is currently being lobbied and considered by the provincial government.*

**Q8: What are the differences in the modelling and assumptions used in 2021 compared to the 2013 CAEP. Do the “2013 CAEP recommendations still stand” after completion of this update?**

*A: In general, the 2013 CAEP plan has a lot of information and context that remains true even with today's improved knowledge and modelling information. Having said that, part of the deliverables from SSG was to update our modelling and create a new revised implementation and monitoring framework that updates and re-schedules our actions, opportunities and measures to achieve the most efficient and cost effective GHG reductions.*

*The most significant differences between 2013 and 2021 models stem from the adoption of the GPC framework and the resulting estimates of emissions from transportation sectors, agriculture, and light industry. Most sector specific estimates were similar, e.g., home heating, commercial, municipal corporate, commuting. Staff will highlight the differences and similarities in emissions estimates in the two models at the next meeting.*

**Q9: The proposed actions in the survey rely heavily on incentives.**

*A: The actions are a starting point to leverage existing or likely provincial and federal programs, many of which ARE incentive based. There are specific opportunities that could be created within a given action for North Cowichan which could complement or augment the incentives already on the table. These incentives will help to generate new employment opportunities and foster a stronger and more sustainable local economy. As we have seen with the Clean BC program (Energy Step Code, Better Homes BC, and Electric Vehicle (EV) and EV charging incentives) the province has ramped up incentives available to the public,*

*businesses and local governments to encourage these types of actions. Staff and consultants foresee expanded offerings of programs like this and the municipality may be able to partner and provide relatively small incentive top ups to increase uptake without stretching existing or likely revenues.*

**Q10: Are regenerative agriculture and soil management techniques that reduce GHG emissions considered in the 2021 modelling?**

*A: There are many actions similar to this which have scientific studies to back them and are generally true. Similar to “embedded emissions” question above, assumptions around these types of actions may be difficult to develop, track, inventory, incorporate, monitor and reproduce in the model. Unfortunately, we need to rely heavily on data and reports that are regularly produced from credible agencies such as Statistics Canada census data etc. to limit the complexity, adhere to the global protocol for community GHG emissions (GPC) and provide consistency in the model moving forward.*

*Furthermore, the GPC was not established in 2013 when the first CAEP was produced. Based on the framework in the GPC, the 2013 plan did not fully consider the emissions from local agricultural practices.*