

EEPAC BUDGET SUBMISSION

Much to be proud of

- Woodland Acquisition Fund
- Strong Official Plan Policies that survived challenges all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada
- EEPAC as a technical advisory committee
- two staff ecologists
- A unique contract with a conservation authority to manage public lands
- a supportive City Council

Much to be proud of

- Yet, we should strive to do more to protect and enhance our Natural Heritage System as per the London Plan and Council's Strategic Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **With No addition to base operating budget:**
 - **1. invasive species management**
 - **2. Animal control enhanced service**

- **With Addition to base operating budget**
 - **3. ESA management**
 - **4. Hydrogeologist**

PUBLIC ENEMY # 1? – Invasive Species



phragmites

RE-ALLOCATION OF NATURAL HERITAGE FUNDS

- \$262,000 annually budgeted for woodlot acquisition
- At present, no draws are forecasted 2016-19 (p. 555 of budget)
- Use part to provide for additional invasive species management
- The problem is large, the amounts allocated are small (ex. only \$100,000 over 10 yrs for Westminster Ponds/Pond Mills ESA)
- **Staff to recommend size of either one time re-allocation or a multi year re-allocation**

ESA MANAGEMENT

- ESA Management Contract reduced 15% in 2014 (\$72K)
- Coves added to contract
- 30 hectares/yr to be added (inc. Pottersburg Valley)
- Lower Dingman?
- Encroachment – by law enforcement staff and UTRCA

RECOMMENDATION

- Piggy back on proposed service enhancement in the base budget for Animal Services (p. 140) :
 - There was a pilot project to monitor bike paths, off leash parks, parks where bikes are

Animal Control Officers to also monitor ESAs for off leash dogs

Add back the cut to the UTRCA management budget

HYDROGEOLOGY expertise needed

- Protecting and improving vulnerable surface and ground water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features and their hydrologic functions are a requirement of Provincial Policy.
- Further hydro geotechnical support will be essential if the City is to meet the province's direction to mandate Low Impact Development
- This skill set is needed for brownfield remediation
- Currently all reports relating to the protection of groundwater, aquifers, and sensitive surface features are directed through the UTRCA. This slows down the review process for staff and for developers.

RECOMMENDATION

- **Council include in the four year budget either the creation of a City of London Hydrogeologist position shared by Engineering and Planning and/or Development Services, or budget sufficient funds in these areas for retaining or contracting the necessary expertise on a regular basis. This would enable the city to better and more quickly move through the regulatory processes related to development and deal with new Provincial Storm Water Management requirements.**

Concerns – Lifecycle Capital Budget

- ESA capital budget has been flat lined - essentially a cut
- No conservation master plans appear to be proposed in lifecycle or growth capital budgets (how will you know what you have until its gone?)

Lifecycle Capital Budget

Yr	Woodland Parks/Management	Major Open Space	Neighbourhood Park Infrastructure	ESAs	Street tree planting
2009	170	235	450	270	260
2010	140	320	430	280	260
2011	0	135	380	190	260
2012	150	70	450	200	260
2013	200	150	410	200	260
2014	150	220	400	200	211
2015	150	270	220	350	411
2016	100	350	180	200	411
2017	100	230	450	200	411
2018	100	450	500	200	411
2019	100	450	500	200	411

Concerns about Lifecycle and Growth Capital Budgets

Current allocation for Natural Heritage insufficient for achieving goals of Council's Strategic Plan and Official Plan

- Appears there are no new Conservation Master Plans proposed
- Unclear how management plans for ESAs (new and existing) will be determined, implemented and monitored

Recommendation for first annual review

- **Review Lifecycle capital budget for ESAs and report back during next year's budget review – what is the consequence of maintaining the status quo?**
- **Review Growth capital budget for ESAs and report back – what is the consequence of not adjusting the proposed budget?**

Recommendation outside of budget

- To Refer to PEC

Review when undevelopable ESA lands are acquired – right now near end of build out. Why not at issuance of building permits?

Strategic Initiatives

- #3 Urban Forest – protect what you have – pass new tree conservation by law dealing with private lands
- #4 TVP – EEPAC just received the EIS – significant Species at Risk challenges
- #17 Winter Maintenance – not in the NHS

Greening the City – a Strategic initiative

- **Consider having green roofs, green walls and/or solar panels included as required elements of new Civic facilities such as the new Community Centres and Libraries included in the capital budget**

Recommendations

With No addition to base operating budget:

- **1. invasive species management**
- **2. Animal control enhanced service**

With Addition to base operating budget

- **3. ESA Management**
- **4. Hydrogeologist**

Review Adequacy of Capital Budget for Nature Heritage